THE ANGLICAN TRADITION

A Discussion of Eucharistic Doctrine

By the Rev.

S. C. Carpenter, B.D.

Vicar of Bolton; Hon. Canon of Manchester
Sometime Fellow and Tutor of Selwyn College, Cambridge

The purpose of this book is to examine Anglican doctrine about the Holy Communion, to see exactly what the Church of England appears to teach. Where does it leave us free? What have we in common? What still remains to be explored and worked out in friendly co-operation?

A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., London and Oxford

THE ANGLICAN TRADITION

THE ANGLICAN TRADITION

A Discussion of Eucharistic Doctrine

BY THE

REV. S. C. CARPENTER, B.D.

Vicar of Bolton, Hon. Canon of Manchester
Sometime Fellow and Tutor of Selwyn College, Cambridge

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.
LONDON: 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.1
OXFORD: 9 High Street
MILWAUKEE, U.S.A.: The Morehouse Publishing Co.
Printed in England

First impression, 1928

PREFACE

THIS little book makes no claim to be either original or profound. But recent controversies have brought to light such widespread misunderstanding of the character and teaching of the Church of England, that it seemed worth while to make another attempt to state the facts and to draw from them some fair conclusions.

The occasion of the book is the promulgation of the Prayer Book Measure, out of which so much controversy has arisen. But, though I am a supporter of the Deposited Book, and though, in particular, the new Canon, with its Epiklesis, is in my judgement a great improvement, my object in these pages is not specifically to put forward a defence of the bishops' work. There is a certain kind of opposition to it which, incidentally, I desire to meet. But that is an opposition which is due to imperfect acquaintance with the real character of the Book of 1662. The vocation which I desire to reclaim for the Church of England is that which has been for centuries our true tradition.

Solvitur Anglicando might have been the title, or anyhow the sub-title, of this book. Because it is my firm conviction that most of our ecclesiastical troubles have been brought about by departure from our own constitution and tradition. I am further persuaded that not merely could troubles be avoided, but great service done to the world, if the Anglican Communion could rise to the height of its own vocation. The urgency of

the need for some bold social gospel, and the peculiar facilities which we possess for broadcasting it; the hopefulness of the work that is being done for Christian Reunion, and our strategic position at the heart of it; the sounding of the World Call, and the fact that, deserved or undeserved, it has in fact come to us—all this shews that the purpose of God holds a future for the Anglican Communion.

The future is always a much more interesting and important region than the past. And it is in that region that true Catholicism lies. It is therefore a nuisance to be obliged often to spend time and thought in arguing about the past or in explaining the present. It is tiresome to be compelled to speak and act as if Catholicism were a matter of links with the past instead of with the future. But I suppose it is part of our penance for missed opportunities that before we can 'break forth on the right hand and on the left,' we must 'repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations.'

As this is not a book for the specialist, I have given few references and added hardly any foot-notes. But readers who are familiar with the subject will perceive that I am indebted to various writers, notably Bishop Gore and Canon Quick.

S. C. CARPENTER.

BOLTON,
Easter, 1928.

TO

S. G. C.

JOINT-HEIR OF THE GRACE OF LIFE

CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	The Main Tradition	1
II.	The Present Stage	25
III.	Some Axioms	49
IV.	Some Theories, and their Implications	73
V.	Spiritual Reality	95
VI.	Anglican Teaching	110

The Anglican Tradition

I

THE MAIN TRADITION

THE main tradition of the English Church is a Reformed and English version of the Catholic tradition. ' Reformed ' and ' English ' are the epithets ; Catholicism is the noun. The epithets qualify ; the noun is the substantial thing. The fact of the Reformation and the course of our national history have given their stamp to the terms on which we hold our inheritance, and to the way in which we use it. But the inheritance itself is the Catholic tradition. The word ' Catholic ' is indispensable. It is constantly misunderstood, and it is also unhappily in danger of becoming tedious because it is heard in some quarters so incessantly. But it cannot be allowed to die.

The word is misused in at least two ways. In the first place, some Anglicans and Nonconformists permit themselves to speak of Roman Catholics as ' Catholics ' and sometimes even as ' the Catholics.' In so doing they are

both ignorant and foolish. They are ignorant because they do not realize the existence of the hundred-and-ten million Eastern Christians, indubitably Catholic, to whom, with their unimpeachable orthodoxy and their unbroken spiritual pedigree, the very Papacy itself still seems a new and upstart thing. And they are foolish because, by making a present of the title which means 'Universal' to one section of the Church, a section from which they are themselves in separation, they de-catholicize and un-church themselves. They mean no harm, and in so far as they are asserting their own 'Protestant,' that is 'Western non-Papal,' character, they are doing something that is, in the circumstances, right and good. But their language is unhistorical and unscientific, and unnecessarily self-disparaging. It is, for Anglicans at least, quite indefensible.

The other misuse of the word is more intricate and more difficult to avoid. Some English Churchmen are accustomed to describe themselves, and other like-minded Churchmen, as Catholics. But they would not, in this sense, concede the title to certain other Churchmen. Thus, you may hear the question, 'Is S. Paul's a Catholic parish?' or, 'Is the vicar a Catholic priest?' And the answer heard is sometimes 'Yes' and sometimes 'No.'

There is something to be said for answering foolish questions in a way that will be understood. Truth of fact is often discernible be-

neath ambiguities of terminology. And it may well be that the answer conveys the kind of information that was sought. But the linguistic coinage of Christendom is thereby debased. It is not that they who so speak are ignorant of history, or of science in so far as it is represented by geography. They are probably aware of the East and its importance, and they are, in general, accustomed to think of the English Church as part of Catholic Christendom. But they damage the value of the word Catholic. It is properly used either of the world-Church itself, or of the spiritual possessions which are held in common by the world-Church. Thus, the Catholic things are the Bible, the Creed, the Sacraments, and the Ministry. Any part of the Church which possesses all these things is Catholic.

There is indeed a difficulty of language which accounts for, though it does not excuse, the error. We have in the Church of England a great many persons of a certain clearly-marked type, a large and important group, for which it is obviously convenient to have a name. They attach a special value to their membership of the universal Church, and to all the things which are Catholic possessions. And they use and interpret those things in a way which is characteristic of Catholic Christendom in general. It seems therefore perfectly reasonable to say that A has a more Catholic outlook than B, or that C is accustomed to a more Catholic

type of worship than D. And yet it is seriously wrong to describe A and C as 'Catholics' and B and D as 'not Catholics.' For to do that is to assume that a man is or is not a Catholic by reason of his own choice, whereas in truth the only way in which he can be a Catholic is by the act of God. If God has placed him in some true part of the Catholic Church, then he has a Catholic inheritance, and he is a Catholic. If by the will of God the Church of England is Catholic, then all our priests are Catholic priests and all our laymen are Catholic laymen.

This book does not profess to know at all what name should be adopted for, or by, what is commonly called the 'Catholic' or 'Anglo-Catholic' section of the Church of England. It is the largest and most vigorous wing of the Church. Perhaps it would be hard to say exactly how much is wing and how much is shoulder. But the section as a whole, wing and shoulder, has contributed much in piety and learning to English Christianity. It has performed a great amount of social service. Within less than a hundred years it has greatly changed the orientation of practically the whole Church of England. It is extremely inconvenient to have no name by which to allude to it. In these pages, in despair, and in order to avoid a clumsy paraphrase, there is occasionally adopted the term 'Anglo-Catholic.' It is indefensible, but it is less disastrous than 'Catholic.' To cheapen the value of Catholicism by using the specific

word that literally means ' universal ' to denote a particular type of person in one part of Christendom is quite impossible.

It was said just now that the word ' Catholic ' is properly used, first of all, and fundamentally, of the world-Church itself. This, if pressed home, will always be admitted. No Anglican, when reminded of the actual meaning of the term, or of its occurrence in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, will hesitate to accept it as an essential term. There is a Catholic Church, and all Anglicans belong to it. That victory has been won, and can, at need, be used.

But it was also said that the term can be properly used of the things which are Catholic possessions—the Bible, the Creed, the Sacraments, and the Ministry. The rightfulness of the claims advanced by some to possess all these things is disputed by others. But there is no question that the Book of Common Prayer claims that the Church of England does possess them. Yet, over and above the constant misuses, already mentioned, of the actual word, it is in practice assumed by very many that the Church of England exists solely to promote some special kind of national Protestant religion. It was, for example, taken for granted by many of the speakers in both Houses of Parliament during the debates on the Prayer Book Measure in December, 1927, that the object of the revision was to turn a Protestant Book into a Catholic Book. The fact is that it would be

difficult to find, anywhere, a much more Catholic book than the Prayer Book of 1662. The quality of its teaching was on the whole very justly estimated by some of those who opposed the Education Act of 1902. They spoke of it as 'steeped in sacerdotalism.' And, if the sinister suggestions that sometimes underlay the choice of words in that expression be eliminated, they were right.

The Prayer Book is indeed, in the historical sense of the term, thoroughly Protestant. That is to say, it is the Book of a Church which, being part of Western Christendom, is Reformed, and has thrown off the Papal yoke. The English Church, expressing its mind through the Prayer Book, has not any particular desire to be out of communion with the Pope. The fact of our separation is a cause of very great regret. But we are totally unable to accept the Papal theory of the Church, or the Papal additions to the common faith of Christendom ; therefore our Book is, and will remain till circumstances over which we have no direct control have greatly changed, inexorably non-Roman ; there is not a shred of Ultramontanism in it. It is also thoroughly English. But antecedently to that, and more fundamentally than that—unless indeed it is to be assumed that the mere existence of a National Church contravenes an essential principle of Catholicism—it is Catholic from end to end. It is in fact a Reformed, English version of the Catholic religion.

At the time of the Reformation it was a bold step for the little Church of England to stand out as a national Church. The pre-Reformation Church in France had already developed much of what has since been called Gallicanism, that is, a national, non-ultramontane form of Catholicism. And England, when led by the stronger of its kings, had made its national protests against the multitude of Papal appeals, the abuses of Papal patronage, and the extortions of Papal legates. But it was France which shewed the way. 'We cannot,' says Dr. Figgis, 'with all our ingenuity, lay claim to any such complex of privileges as the Gallican liberties, although Matthew Paris affords evidence how strong was the anti-Papal feeling in England at the very height of the Papal power.' We followed the French lead. English delegates took a considerable part in the work of the international Conciliar Movement, that last great effort of the Mediaeval Church to reform itself, which was due to the French thinkers, Gerson, D'Ailly, and the rest. But that failed, and when the crash came, it was a bold step for a small nation to stand out alone, and yet to claim that continued share in the Catholic inheritance which Rome, at first tentatively, and then vigorously, denied.

Since then the Anglican Communion has grown enormously. It now includes the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, the Dominion Churches, and a great number of

Anglican Missionary dioceses of both British and American foundation. The Anglican Communion cannot now be described as a National Church in the old sense. And, apart from that, in mere size it is now large enough to stand side by side with Rome, a much smaller but not inconsiderable neighbour. Unable for the present to be a colleague, unwilling to be thought of as an enemy or even as a rival, it is at least a neighbour. It has grown in stature, and while it has ceased to be national in the former sense, it has not lost its essential religious character and *raison d'être*. That character is to present to the world a Reformed and (there seems to be no other word) Anglican version of the Catholic tradition. And the Prayer Book of 1662 is a standing witness to this fact.[1]

[1] By 'Anglican' here two things are meant. (*a*) The Anglican Communion is, historically, sprung from England, and it accordingly has among people of English stock, even though they may live under another flag and be members of another nation, a certain racially-imposed character. In the missionary dioceses the mistake was formerly made of attempting too mechanically to acclimatize on Oriental soil peculiarly English forms of expression and features arising from the accidents of English history. This is now being abandoned. An Indian national Church is being built up in India; South Africa has developed a South African Liturgy,—and so on. As this proceeds, the racially-imposed character will gradually change.

But (*b*) apart from race, there is another thing that belongs to Anglicanism, that which is described in the text as 'its essential religious character and *raison d'être*.' Anglicanism endeavours in things theological as well as in things ecclesias-

The sisters of the 1662 Book, the Scottish, the American, and the South African Prayer Books, have an advantage here and there. And the Deposited Book, drawing, as it does, from a richer store-house of liturgical material than was available in 1662, and covering, as it does, a wider range of human needs, is in that sense more Catholic. But to pretend that the 1662 Book is not a Catholic book is fantastic.

If it is not, why did Richard Baxter and the Puritans suppose that they had failed at the Savoy Conference? Why did the two thousand ministers go out on S. Bartholomew's Day? Many of us regret the high-handed methods of the Restoration bishops (a fault often seen in men who have endured persecution and suddenly find themselves in power), and many of us regret their extreme insistence on uniformity. But no one who is acquainted with the contents of their Book can mistake their intention. And it is one of the facts of history that the Book proved intolerable to the Puritans.

If Lord Carson and Sir William Joynson-Hicks had been alive in 1662, and had studied

tical to comprehend at the same time old loyalties and new learning. In other words, we stand not only for the Catholic tradition, but for the Evangelical tradition and the Liberal tradition. These things we try to combine in a way for which there seems no other word but 'Anglican.' This spirit, which is not racial, but, in a high and noble sense of the word, political, lives and will live not only in the Dominion Churches, but in the United States and in such Churches as the *Nippon Sei Kokwai* of Japan.

the new Prayer Book with fresh eyes, they would have read many parts of it with surprise and dismay. They would have discovered from the title page that the book was a 'Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies *of the Church*,' and that these Catholic things were to be ministered '*according to the Use of the Church of England*.' Reading the Prefaces, they would have been surprised to see the constant appeal to 'the ancient Fathers,' or to learn that the compilers had rejected every proposed alteration which was 'of dangerous consequence (as secretly striking at some established doctrine, or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholick Church of Christ).' If they had been alive in 1549 they would have seen from the Preface *Concerning the Service of the Church*, which was then first composed, and reprinted in 1662, that 'the service *in this Church of England* these many years hath been read in Latin to the people.' They would at either date have been surprised by many other things in the Communion Service, in the Ordinal, and in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick.[1]

[1] e.g. in the 1662 Book (*a*) the recommendation in the First Exhortation in the Communion Service that communicants should have recourse to private confession and absolution, whenever they may feel it to be necessary; (*b*) the words used at the ordering of priests, 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church

Why is it that they are not more impressed by these things now? The answer is that they have hardly noticed them. It is the simple fact that very many read the Prayer Book, as Dr. Dearmer pointed out long ago, through Hanoverian spectacles. They assume that they know all about it, and that, when they have said that the Church of England is Established and is Protestant, they have said all that is necessary. This delusion is shared by a great many members of the Church of England.

There is no considerable part of Christendom whose members are so ignorant of their true status and their proper ecclesiastical duty as the Church of England. Happily, some know. The great majority of the clergy have, broadly speaking, caught the spirit of the Prayer Book. Their interpretation and their emphasis are far from uniform. And, quite apart from the technical illegalities, which by common consent have become in the course of two hundred and sixty-six years inevitable and unblameworthy, many make unauthorized additions or omissions. But the great majority of the clergy are, broadly speaking, Prayer Book men.

Of the laity, happily, some know. The leaders of the laity, most of those who are

of God. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, etc.'; (*c*) the formula prescribed for private absolution, 'By his authority committed unto me I absolve thee from all thy sins in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

elected to Diocesan Conferences or the Church Assembly, all who take an intelligent part in the work of the parish, all who read and think, have likewise a fairly true conception of the nature of the Church of England. Most of them leave undone a great many of the duties which the Prayer Book expects that they will perform. But they know the sort of thing for which the Church of England stands. Of the rank and file this cannot be said. Very many are zealous and devoted Christians, happy in their church, praying and worshipping in it with fervour, giving alms to it with liberality, eager for its good. Yet many of them know curiously little of its real character.

The error is not altogether unnatural. The history of the English Church since 1662 has actually been very different from what the Prayer Book makers in 1662 expected. In the first place the Establishment has not worked in the anticipated way. No one knows how far the bishops at the Savoy Conference realized that, if the proposed Book came in, the Puritans would go out, and Nonconformity, on a large and serious scale, would begin. It had been the common practice for the side which for the moment was in opposition to hold on and hope for a turn in the tide. And though they must have known that the Puritans would not like their Book, they may have thought that all, or nearly all of them, would be able to endure it. Anyhow, they assumed in their Book that the

Elizabethan Concordat, which was then renewed, would cover practically the whole ground, that practically every Englishman would be an Anglican. This has not happened. A large number broke away at once. It thus became from the very first difficult to recognize in the Church of England a part of the Catholic Church operating over national ground.

Since then a situation has gradually grown up in which we have learned to acquiesce. Anglicans, Roman Catholics, Nonconformists, and non-Christians now live more or less peacefully side by side with one another. But under Charles II, the intolerance of Parliament, especially the House of Commons, worked in the direction of turning the Church of England from being what it was intended to be into a political machine for the harrying of Dissenters. The Act of Uniformity, the Corporation Act, the Conventicle Act, the Five Mile Act, and the Test Act, all passed between 1662 and 1673, were all repressive and unchristian measures. They were acts of the civil power, and four of them were repealed, while the Act of Uniformity became partially inoperative, in course of time. But they had in their heyday plenty of backing in the Church itself, and they left behind them as a legacy to the Church a spirit of social arrogance and even of willingness to persecute, which has endured here and there until to-day. All this has in part obscured and in part actually damaged the

Catholic character which the Church of England was intended to exhibit and does in fact possess.

On the other hand, the fact of being Established, of being described as a National Church, and of actually being in a perfectly real sense a National Church, has caused our boundaries to be in practice rather ragged. Most Englishmen, except those who definitely belong elsewhere or are quite sure that they belong nowhere, have a general sense of belonging to the Church of England. This has its advantages, but it lowers the standard of efficiency. The English parson has a double capacity. He is a priest of the Church, ministering to members of his Church in spiritual things. He also exists and is used for the general religious benefit of large numbers of people who, theologically and ecclesiastically, are rather vague. He is glad to serve in both capacities, and he enjoys them both. But they are not the same.

For these two reasons it might be said either that the original Concordat has broken down or that it has not had a fair chance. At all events, a situation has arisen for which the 1662 Book made no provision. The two ways in which the course of events since 1662 has disappointed expectations do not themselves destroy the genuinely Catholic character of the Church of England, and by the law of the land the genuinely Catholic Book of 1662 is still our official manual. But (1) the departure of

the Puritans (and later of the Methodists and others) has prevented the Church of England from being completely national. And (2) the vagueness of many of our supposed adherents has caused both the Prayer Book and the Church of England to be thought less Catholic than they really are. When the Archbishop of York, commenting on the debates in Parliament on the Prayer Book Measure, remarked that the real issue was whether the Deposited Book was congruous with the Book of Common Prayer, one newspaper replied in effect, 'Pardon me. That is not the question. The question is whether the Deposited Book is congruous with the known Protestant character of the Church of England.' First, assume the verdict, and then misunderstand and discount the evidence.

The exodus of S. Bartholomew's Day, 1662, was followed by that of the Non-Jurors. When the Stewart dynasty was expelled in 1688, a considerable number of the best and most spiritual members of the Church, including Archbishop Sancroft, Bishop Ken, Bishop Frampton, and about four hundred of the parochial clergy, could not forget their oath of allegiance to the former king.

It was not that they were political Jacobites. In fact five of them—Sancroft, Ken, Turner, Lloyd, and White—had been among the seven bishops who, a few years before, had boldly resisted a high-handed and unconstitutional action of King James. They made no rebel-

lion. They were perfectly constitutional in what they did. They became Non-Jurors. The monarch to whose actual person they had sworn allegiance being still alive, they felt it a point of honour to resign their emoluments. They went out, not to join the ex-king, or to engineer his return, or to share his religious views, but into the wilderness. They were followed by some of the best of the laity.

In their departure the Church of England lost much of that element which would have helped it most to maintain and exhibit its English Catholic character. And while it is of course never safe to assume that all or nearly all the conscience is on one side, and none or almost none on the other, it is also true that there was more worldliness in those who stayed than in those who went.

From that time Whiggery was in the ascendant in the Church as in the State. The bishops were younger sons, or adherents, of the great Whig families. They had a very secular conception of their office, and during the whole of the eighteenth century the Church was thought of by most people, including many of its own members, as the State department for the purposes of religion.

During the earlier years of the century, at the time of the Rebellion of 1715, many of the clergy were suspected of plotting for the restoration of the Stewarts. This was probably unjust. They were not actual Jacobites. But

they were Tories. They resented the Whig bishops, and the Lower House of Convocation was often contumacious. Accordingly, in 1717 Convocation was suppressed, and for nearly a century and a half, till 1850, the Church of England was without a constitutional voice. This was only one of many signs of decadence. A process of general demoralization set in.

The Christianity of England became worldly and barren. Wesley did noble work, but the Church at that time could not endure the simple reality of the Methodists, and they were gradually pushed out. The churches were filled well enough, because church-going was still a habit. But it was due to a sense of decency rather than to any exuberance of spiritual life.

Bishop Butler, one of the very best of the bishops of the period, complained that Christianity was commonly thought a fit subject for mirth and ridicule, and, when at the age of fifty-five he was offered the Archbishopric of Canterbury, he is said to have replied that he was too old to prop a falling Church.

About 1830, just before the Reform Act, the Church was believed by nearly all to be doomed to speedy extinction. It is true that the Evangelical Revival had converted many Churchmen, had produced many saints, and had effected many social reforms. But it had not raised the question of the independent quality of the spiritual life of the Church as a whole. Those who were converted lived good Chris-

tian lives, and those of them who were Churchmen were well content to live their Christian lives within the Established Church. But, though they were quite sure that their own personal vocation was from God, and though they vexed important people with their exasperating habit of carrying religion into daily life, they did not precipitate a constitutional crisis.

Great and beneficent as was the work of the Evangelical Revival, the questions that it prompted men to ask were mainly personal and individual : 'Am I converted?' 'Shall I be saved?' They were also, in a real though limited sense of the word, social : 'What can I do for the African brother, for whom Christ died?' But they did not reopen the subject of the nature of the ecclesiastical polity by asking whether the Church of England were a true part of the Catholic Church.

It is hardly possible to exaggerate the surprise with which the Oxford Movement came upon the Church. It may be estimated from the prediction of a forgotten pioneer. Like Keble's father among the clergy, like Joshua Watson and Alexander Knox among the laity, Dr. T. Sykes, a Northamptonshire rector, had kept alive the old tradition. At some date, which cannot exactly be ascertained, but must have been well before 1842, he used these words :

> I can tell you something which you who are young will probably live to see, but which I, who shall soon

be called away off the stage, shall not. Wherever I go all about the country I see amongst the clergy a number of very amiable and estimable men, many of them much in earnest, and wishing to do good. But I have observed one universal want in their teaching, the uniform suppression of one great truth. There is no account given anywhere, so far as I see, of the one Holy Catholic Church. I think that the causes of this suppression have been mainly two. The Church has been kept out of sight, partly in consequence of the civil establishment of the branch of it which is in this country, and partly out of false charity to Dissent.

Now, this great truth is an article of the Creed, and, if so, to teach the rest of the Creed to its exclusion must be to destroy 'the analogy or proportion of the faith.' This cannot be done without the most serious consequences. The doctrine is of the last importance, and the principles it involves of immense power, and some day, not far distant, it will judicially have its reprisals. And whereas the other articles of the Creed seem now to have thrown it into the shade, it will seem, when it is brought forward, to swallow up the rest. We now hear not a breath about the Church ; by and by, those who live to see it will hear of nothing else, and just in proportion perhaps to its present suppression will be its future development. Our confusion nowadays is chiefly owing to the want of it, and there will be yet more confusion attending its revival. The effects of it I even dread to contemplate, especially if it come suddenly. And woe betide those, whoever they are, who shall, in the course of Providence, have to bring it forward.

It ought, especially of all others, to be matter of catechetical instruction and training. The doctrine of the Church Catholic and the privileges of Church

membership cannot be explained from pulpits ; and those who will have to explain it will hardly know where they are, or which way they are to turn themselves. They will be endlessly misunderstood and misinterpreted. There will be one great outcry of Popery from one end of the country to the other. It will be thrust upon minds unprepared and on an uncatechized Church. Some will take it up and admire it as a beautiful picture ; others will be frightened, and run away and reject it ; and all will want a guidance which one hardly knows where they shall find. How the doctrine may be first thrown forward we know not, but the powers of the world may any day turn their backs upon us, and this will probably lead to those effects I have described. [1]

This was a very remarkable prediction. As every one knows, it was abundantly fulfilled when, from 1833 onwards, the men of the Oxford Movement began to assert that the Church of England was really a part of the Catholic Church, with a God-given, independent spiritual life. They called attention to the Catholic possessions of the Church of England—Baptism, the Eucharist, the Apostolical Succession, Priesthood, Absolution, and so forth. They were profoundly convinced that of these possessions no Parliamentary enactment could ever deprive them. They said so frankly, to the surprise of all. This raised in an acute form the question of the nature of the Church of England.

The Oxford men had the Prayer Book on

[1] *The Story of Dr. Pusey's Life*, p. 76.

their side. But they were at first a tiny minority. Nearly all the bishops disowned them. And all the secular authorites, from Parliament to *Punch*, agreed to treat them as naughty and offensive little boys. The Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874 was described by Disraeli, who passed it, as 'a Bill to put down Ritualism.' The word ritualism was there used in the common but inaccurate way to denote an inordinate devotion to ceremonies.

In actual fact the object of the original Oxford leaders had not been in the least to introduce ceremonies into Anglican worship. Pusey was not interested in such matters. His interest was in maintaining that the Church of England was divinely commissioned to teach the Catholic Faith, to administer the Catholic Sacraments, and to commend the Catholic way of life. But the next generation of the Movement, the Lowders, the Stantons, and the Dollings, had to carry the Oxford teachings into the slums. Their cure of souls lay, not among Oxford graduates, or the intelligent reading public, but among thieves and outcasts. They had to *do* something. What were they to do ?

Their theologically-minded godfathers at Oxford had been repudiated by their Church. The authorities had done their best to prevent the Catholic treasures of the Church of England from being freely made available. And now they themselves, the evangelistically-souled godchildren of the old Tractarians, all on fire to

preach the Gospel to the poor, were repudiated even more violently by the authorities. Some of them were even put in prison. What wonder that they concluded that Anglicanism, though it had conveyed to them their essential equipment, their Catholic Baptism, their Catholic Orders, their Catholic Eucharist, had no living message about the urgent duty of using their Catholic equipment for the spiritual benefit of their flocks.

They desired with all their hearts to commend Eucharistic worship to their people, and to make their people fit for it. To do this, they knew that they must surround the Lord's Supper with beauty and dignity. They knew that they must so order the devotion of their people that they would learn to approach the Sacrament with eager love and yet with careful penitence and humble faith. What were they to do?

There was, in actual fact, at their elbow, all the time, the Ornaments Rubric, containing exactly what was wanted. But no one seemed to know this. The bishops denied it. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council gave repeated judgements to the effect that the Rubric either meant nothing at all or that it meant the opposite of what it appeared to mean. Accordingly they turned to a Church that did at least seem to be alive and to have a method for shepherding Christ's poor. They read Roman books of ceremonial, they put up Roman altars

with gradines and six candlesticks, they introduced vestments of non-English pattern, they covered their heads in the day of battle with Italian birettas.

There is a certain melancholy irony in the fact that they did all this at the very time when Pugin was trying to revive a truer conception of beauty in the Roman Church itself. But the English slum-priests did not know this. They did what they did for purely pastoral reasons. It might even be said that they did it for evangelical reasons. They had not the least intention of turning their people into Roman Catholics. Some, as a matter of fact, after a time lost heart and head and went over to Rome. But most of them never thought about it. In fact they had very little time to think of anything except that they were priests, in parishes, with the cure of souls. Their own Church, in which they had been born, in which they hoped to live and die, did not seem to have much help for them in their difficult and absorbing craft. And so they borrowed the external customs of another Church.

It was an unhappy error. But the excuses in those early days were the prejudice of their judges, their own liturgical ignorance, and the fact that they were persecuted men.

They performed a great work. And that not only in their own actual parishes, for the souls of their parishioners, but for the Church of England as a whole. They called the atten-

tion of the public, as the Oxford leaders had called the attention of the learned world, to a thing that had become almost forgotten, the main tradition of the English Church. Many of them clothed that tradition in a form that was unauthorized and ill-fitting. But the apparel does not in every case proclaim the man. It would have saved trouble and nipped many sincere misgivings in the bud if they had been better informed. But no sensible person supposes that things of that kind are of great importance. Their chief work was to teach the reality of the Eucharistic gift, the beauty of holiness, and the value of confession. Through them and their work, God revived the Catholic soul of the Church of England.

II

THE PRESENT STAGE

'OTHER men laboured, and ye are entered into their labours.' The ideas which Pusey and Keble spent their lives in teaching, and the outward expression which men like Lowder, the Pollocks, and Mackonochie gave to them, have become established within the Church of England. It is indeed a great tribute to the vitality of the Church that the four movements, the two which have been mentioned, together with the Liberal Movement and the Christian Social Movement, have all been assimilated. The Church of England has been strong enough to adopt and incorporate them all, and, having done so, is all the stronger for it. The combined effect of all four is an immense gain in spiritual force. 'The Church of England,' to use the flippant but shrewd epigram of the *New Statesman*, 'in its old age has got religion.'

We are here concerned with one only of four admirable reinforcements. But there is no doubt about its reinforcing effect. The value of the work of the 'Anglo-Catholic' Movement in the Church of England is very great.

Thousands through it have learned for the first time to pray and worship, and have gained a wholly new and greatly improved idea of Christian duty and of how to find the divine grace that will enable them to do it. Sinners have been rescued from the power of sin, and saintly characters have been developed. Some 'Anglo-Catholics' are narrow and intolerant; but Catholic ideas, unless they go altogether the wrong way and fail completely of their purpose, are larger and wider than any others. No thoughtful Churchman to-day can possibly want to return to the Church life of the eighteenth century as it is described by Thackeray, or of the nineteenth century as it is described by Dickens.

In the Church itself the reinforcement has been absorbed. The Church Assembly, if called upon, would vote that the Oxford Movement was on the whole a good thing. Even where it is not particularly liked, the Movement would be accepted in the Church itself as a legitimate development. In fact, the recent policy of the main body of Evangelicals and of a large central non-party group in the House of Laity has, in the matter of the Deposited Book, been magnificently generous.

The Book contains many things which have very little to do with the Oxford Movement, and some which Pusey, Keble, and Liddon would have greatly disliked. But it includes, broadly speaking, a vote of confidence in the

Oxford Movement. A great many members of the Assembly, not eager themselves for some of the actual changes proposed, nevertheless saw that the Book gave good hope of peace and progress in the Church, and were resolved to be as comprehensive as they could. Careful, as the bishops had been careful, to guard against what seemed to them illegitimate, they were determined not to be ungenerous. And they will in time receive the reward of generosity. They will see that it has helped to restore peace to the Church, and they will also see that the usages which they have sanctioned are not unevangelical in character.

Later additions to the Deposited Book restored the Black Rubric and stiffened the restrictions that surround the permission to reserve the Blessed Sacrament. They also gave a degree of sanction to the practice of non-fasting Communion which had not formally been given before. These things, with other directions that affected the relation of priest and people, alienated a good many of the inheritors of the Oxford tradition.

It was not to be expected that they would be welcome in that quarter. But they were intended to have a reassuring effect in other quarters. They were intended to satisfy the rather indeterminate layman of many a parish, who vaguely supposed that the new Prayer Book was a one-sided affair. And they were intended to encourage the Evangelical and to

do justice to his share in the life of the Church by making certain affirmations of the kind that he felt to be important and desirable. So far it does not seem fair that they should be condemned.

In so far as they were born of a desire to conciliate Parliament—'that two-handed engine at the door'—which had already smitten once with the blameless, devastating accuracy of a good machine employed for a wrong purpose, they produced very grave searchings of heart among many who were eager to support the bishops. It thus happens that the recent history of the Book has made it in one direction easier to use the argument of the united Church, in another direction has made it more difficult. But, even so, it remains true that for Evangelicals and the central group of Lay Representatives to approve a Book which sanctioned perpetual Reservation was a generous policy.

But in all this the Church, as represented in the Assembly, is far ahead of the nation and of Parliament. The Oxford Movement has not yet become established in the affections, or even altogether within the toleration, of the English people. If the attention of 'the man in the street' were to be drawn to the Rubric prescribing that 'the chancels shall remain as they have done in times past,' he would still suppose that the reference was to 1849 rather than to 1549. A vote of the House of Commons, or

still more a referendum of the population of England, would maintain that the Oxford Movement was on the whole to be regretted.

What is the cause of this? It is in part due to bad tactics. This means not merely mistaken and unwise tactics, but unchristian tactics. There has been in the clergy a lack of pastoral consideration. The advance has not always been by consent.

The rights and wrongs of this are not quite so simple as is sometimes supposed. A pastor has teaching duties, and teaching is given not only by verbal instruction but by symbols and symbolic action. Very often the consent has been given afterwards, sometimes with overflowing gratitude and enthusiasm. But it is the fact that in the recovery of the true character, or something like it, of the English Church the clergy have led the way, and in a large number of cases they have not carried the laity with them.

In their objective the clergy were in the main right. In method they were often high-handed and unkind. Lay consent was often given grudgingly and sometimes withheld. Laymen have sometimes gone out quietly into another Church, or into nothing, and sometimes have remained to foment an anti-clerical campaign. That is why the present crisis is of immense importance for the well-being of the Church of England. The situation is that the clergy are on the whole right. The Church

of England really is what they claim that it is. At present a great many of the laity do not know it. If they discover it soon, we shall have a really Christian Church of England, with large differences of emphasis but no quarrelling, and with a real unity for the doing of God's work. If they do not discover it soon, it will presently be too late. The breach between clergy and laity will have become over a considerable part of the ground unhealable. And we shall have a sadly unchristian Church.

A second difficulty has been, not an error of clergymen in handling and shepherding the people of a parish, but an error, of clergy and laity, in understanding and outlook. The same mistake is being made in this generation as was made in the 'seventies of last century.

At the present time there is much less excuse for it than there was. It is now well known that there is an English Catholic tradition, embodied in the Prayer Book, summed up in the Ornaments Rubric. The available evidence has been thoroughly examined, and it is set forth in detail in a number of books, notably the publications of the Alcuin Club. There is plenty of information shewing what an English cathedral or parish church ought to look like, and what should be done therein. Yet there are parishes which pride themselves on having a purely Roman type of ceremonial. There are priests and laymen who disparage the 'English use' as 'British Museum religion.'

It is not intended to suggest that the choice of any particular type of ceremonial is in itself of great importance. And there are ways in which the devoutness and efficiency of Roman Catholics deserve to be imitated, and can quite wholesomely be transplanted. But such preferences are sometimes joined to a narrow and intolerant outlook. There is in some quarters, when episcopal discipline is unwelcome, a disposition to break out into what can strangely but truly be described as a rebellious 'Protestantism.' Entrenched in a favourable environment, with devoted lay support, some priests appear to think in terms of 'the Catholic movement in our parishes,' with little regard for the future of the Anglican Communion as a whole, or of the urgent hopes and perils of the world-situation.

Such men are not indeed specifically 'Papal.' They do not admit the necessity of being in communion with the Pope. They do not admit the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. They wholeheartedly believe in the validity of English Orders. Yet some of them not merely prefer and use the Roman type of ceremonial, but are accustomed to interpolate portions of the Roman Liturgy, sometimes in Latin, into the English service; they are 'Scholastic' or 'Tridentine' in their theological method; and where, as often, they have behind them a strong and devoted congregation, they minimize that more difficult part of the English pastor's duty, which

bids him be ready to help all his parishioners, 'enlightened' or 'unenlightened.'

All Christian priests rightly live and think in a way very different from that of the *average* inhabitant of their parishes. But some of the priests (and people) of what are called 'Anglo-Catholic' parishes are seriously out of touch with the main stream of Church of England life. The object of the Anglo-Catholic Congress Movement is 'the conversion of England.' But some of its supporters have not taken the essential preliminary step of ascertaining what the people of England are like.[1]

No doubt they are often provoked by intemperate Protestant propaganda. No doubt they are often wounded by unsympathetic or even hostile action, taken by bishops and others in authority, or by the Erastian assumptions of some who speak in Parliament or write in the Press. No doubt it is often taken for granted by some who demand the abolition of 'Devotions' that any belief in the Real Presence is in the Church of England illegitimate. Such

[1] 'Again and again I felt no one has a right to teach others who is not learning from them. I came to India with everything to teach and nothing to learn. I now stay to learn as well, and I am a better man for having come into contact with the gentle heart of the East. I think I know now the meaning of Ezekiel's going to the captives by the river to speak to them out of the "heat and bitterness of his spirit." As he was about to speak, God said, No, Ezekiel, not yet. Sit down. And "for seven days I sat where they sat," said Ezekiel' (Stanley Jones, *Christ at the Round Table*, p. 47).

things are hard to bear. Such things deny, dismiss, or revile, convictions which to those who hold them are dearer than life itself. They wound devout consciences in a vital place. But some of the wounded consciences, devout and scrupulous in that which is taken to be the really important ethical area, have allowed themselves along part of the line of conduct to develop a scornful outlook. The word 'Anglican' has come to be used contemptuously, and it is really not easy to see how some of these men are likely in years to come to find in the Church of England a place that will be congenial either to the Church or to themselves. They are sometimes called 'extremists.' But the term is not accurate. The suggestion of it is not fair to others.

The existence and the extravagances of these so-called extremists have brought about reactions. To take first the crudest and most violent of the reactions, they have kept alive and have even fostered a species of Protestantism of which it is difficult to speak in polite terms. No one, it may be hoped, would ever think with anything but humble admiration of the beautiful Evangelical Christianity of such men as the late Dr. Handley Moule. No one would even pass adverse moral judgements on those simple souls who have in them such an antipathy to Popery that they instinctively prefer whatever seems most opposite to it. It is not of such Evangelicals or even of such

Protestants that any English Churchmen have a right to complain. It may be hoped that with wider education and enlarged experience certain limitations and hesitations will disappear. But that may well be left till God shall send it.

The Protestantism of which English Churchmen may justly complain is a thing which has appeared here and there from time to time since the sixteenth century. It is peculiarly characteristic of the seventeenth century. It has very little in common with present day English Nonconformity, and it appears to be largely recruited from Northern Ireland. It is obsessed by a real, burning hatred of Popery, and it discerns the hateful thing everywhere. A candle, a fald-stool, a procession, a banner, a psalm-chant, even the opening of the doors of a parish church on weekdays, have all been condemned in violently unchristian terms as shreds of Popery. Very few distinctions are drawn. All are tarred with the same brush. Archbishops, bishops, clergy, diocesan conferences, Church Assembly, nearly every parish, all are apostate. All, except the small remnant which still talks about the Scarlet Woman and, incidentally, still believes in the verbal inerrancy of the Old Testament, are in the same condemnation.

Is there in their neighbourhood a clergyman who is trying to commend and put into practice the Book of Common Prayer? Such a clergyman

will, in accordance with the rubric, 'diligently from time to time exhort his parishioners to the often receiving of the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ.' He will provide frequent opportunities for receiving the Sacrament. To assist his parishioners to prepare themselves he will, at least occasionally, read aloud the exhortation provided for the purpose, and indicate where and when he will be found to give the spiritual help that he is bound to offer. If there is in an adjoining parish a priest of this sort, it is supposed (quite erroneously) that he would like, if he could, to assimilate the worship of his church to that of whatever is the most notorious 'Anglo-Catholic' church of the moment. It is further supposed that he is a man of dishonest and degraded character, a secret Papist, not fit to walk the streets, a canting hypocrite, a senseless idolater, a worshipper of bread, a Judas Iscariot. His wicked devices (in the matter of Prayer Book Revision) God, in December, 1927, happily frustrated, and now it can only be hoped that confusion after confusion will descend upon his ignorant and empty head. This language is extracted from actual letters received from anonymous members of 'the Protestant under-world.'

In arguing with such persons reason is useless. No argument will avail with those who denounce the sign of the Cross (except at Holy Baptism) on the ground that crucifixion was a

Roman punishment. Nothing will meet the prejudices of those who admit that the reunion of all Christians (including 'even the Roman Catholics') is theoretically to be desired, but are brought up short by a verse in the New Testament: 'Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, and few there be that find it.' The recollection of this verse compels them to say, 'If there were too many Christians, my Bible would be proved to be untrue, and that I could not bear'! What is to be done with this? Argument is useless. The only possible course is to wait until it dies.

This kind of Protestantism, like all other kinds, came into existence as a protest against Rome. But, not content with protesting, it attacks. And Rome is still sometimes the actual objective of its attacks. But sometimes it really seems as if the sin of Rome might almost be forgiven. Like the ingrained depravity of some hardened drug-taker, it is by this time hardly culpable. It is in the blood. It has become an irresistible disease. The fault of it is almost venial, compared with the utter blackness of those who, out of mere pride and sinful curiosity, are beginning to toy with the accursed thing. So there can be heard from some Protestant platforms this sort of thing: 'I can understand the position of a Roman Catholic. I do not agree with it. But I can understand it. I can even respect it. But these men, these self-styled priests, who eat the

bread of the Church of England, and teach the doctrines of the Church of Rome, what are they? Traitors ! ! ! Why don't they go out like honest men and go to Rome? They are too anxious to retain their livings ! '

Such an attitude towards fellow-disciples of the Lord Jesus, if its published or anonymously-written sentiments gave an adequate account of it, would have no merit whatever. It *seems* to consist entirely of saying (in Ireland), ' To hell with the Pope,' and (in England), ' To purgatory with the Pope, and to hell with the Anglo-Catholics.' Doubtless in private life the writers and circulators of such sentiments say their prayers and do many Christian works. But their theological position, as defined, looks like the negative or purely Protestant position of sheer hatred of the Pope, his house, his ox, his ass, and all that is assumed to be his or to be in league with him. Such a position is both wicked and foolish. It is always wicked to hate any one. And it is foolish to let any emotion (except love) take up the whole of the horizon.

It was this party which supplied a good deal of the ammunition which alarmed some Members of Parliament so much that they voted against the Prayer Book Measure.

There is of course not the smallest intention of suggesting that all those who opposed the Deposited Book from the Protestant end were Protestants of this sort, were inspired by such

motives, or used such methods. Men like the Vicar of Islington and Sir Thomas Inskip are incapable of such things. They are indeed thorough-going partisans. They belong historically to a section of the Church which can fairly be said to take a minimizing view of the Prayer Book, though it has a true and deep affection for the Book as a whole. They have lately had the mortification of seeing the majority of their fellow-Evangelicals ranged against them in approval of the new Book. They remain honestly convinced that the Book has a Romeward tendency, and they have declared their conviction repeatedly and with great emphasis. They were in fact misinformed, and in effect unfair. But they are Christian men, anxious to think reasonably and accustomed to speak with charity. It is unthinkable that they should approve the tactics of the under-world. Yet it was unfortunate that intelligent men of high character should have allowed a cause which they were perfectly entitled to champion to be even in the smallest way indebted to the help of such scurrilous, blaspheming jackals.

The thing which imparts an air of verisimilitude to what would otherwise be unconvincing is the extravagance of some 'Anglo-Catholics.' Alarmed by this, and persuaded that 'the price of liberty is unsleeping vigilance,' the thorough-going Protestants, those who are Protestant and nothing else, have succeeded in

alarming Parliament and the nation. They have contrived to infect the public with a strong suspicion even of a Measure which is fathered by the Archbishop of Canterbury himself. Against the Archbishop's own character and motives neither Parliament nor people will hear anything. There is for him nothing but respect and admiration. But agitators have introduced into the national mind the suspicion that he is 'meek and gentle with these' ritualists. What ought the archbishops and bishops to have done with them? What can be done? Is there a *modus vivendi*?

To have absolute uniformity in the Church of England is quite impossible and most undesirable. The task of dragooning devoted and conscientious, even if sometimes scornful, men into a reluctant, and even more scornful, semi-discipline would be repulsive to the best and most Christian bishops. Indeed, many who in 1927 warmly supported the Deposited Book as not merely a liturgical improvement on the 1662 Book but as the best hope of peace and unity for the Church, were nevertheless ready to admit that there is something to be said for a bolder and more generous policy all round. What is meant is a policy which would deliberately permit dangerous experiments, a policy which has enough confidence in the truth to believe that whatever is true will eventually make good, and whatever is false will eventually fail.

Such a policy is not in fact at all likely to be officially accepted in regard to, say, organized 'Devotions.' It is not likely, because those who are sure that the underlying theory is true are very few in number, the benevolent, 'agnostic' Gamaliels are still fewer, and the great majority of Churchmen are quite sure that it is false. If the demon of party-spirit would relax his grip on the throat of the Church of England, an experimental policy would be more easy to adopt. It would also be more healthy when adopted than it could possibly be at the present moment. At present the faint possibility of such permissions is thought of too much as a possible party-triumph, or as an impossible party-concession. If such permissions were officially given, it is inevitable that they would be arranged compromises, reached after careful and long-continued lobbying. The unwelcome truth of course is that the Gamaliels are, ideally, right. We do not yet know whether the psychology of those who frequent 'Devotions' is only a crude reaction to a well-devised but unjustifiable ecclesiastical suggestion, or genuine witness to a theological truth of God.

But, party being what it is, and prejudice being what it is, we are not ready for a policy of sane and cool experiment. And it has not in fact been proposed to authorize such experiments as 'Devotions.' In the matter of the use of the Sacrament the policy of the bishops cannot be called ungenerous. The assents of

the Diocesan Conferences and of the House of Laymen must be called very generous. But the policy does include some definite prohibitions. As *The Times* said in a leading article on January 10, 1928, 'The broad effect of the Prayer Book settlement is unquestionably to curtail, and not to extend extravagances in the Church of England.' And until 'Devotions' are authorized, there is no case for them in the Church of England.[1]

But the difficulties of the Church of England will not be cured by forbidding, or by refraining from the authorization of, 'Devotions.' The only possible course is for the bishops to act together and to make it clear that they have a policy for the Church of England. It will have to be based on sure foundations, and, inasmuch as the Church of England is an Established Church, it is obviously desirable that Parliament shall approve their policy. But if Parliament cannot be induced to approve, the things that matter most can all be dealt

[1] It must be remembered that those who were most sore about the restrictions of the Reservation rubrics did not complain of the Deposited Book because it forbade 'Devotions.' The complaint was that, whereas the canonical duty of the parish priest is (in their view) to reserve continuously for the benefit of any who may at any time need Communion, the Deposited Book directs him, if he desires to reserve continuously, to apply for an *ad hoc* license from the bishop. There were also difficulties connected with the re-worded Eucharistic Canon and the disuse of the Athanasian Creed.

with without the help of Parliament. The sure foundations are (1) The Evangelical Gospel, i.e. that which is summed up in the words, 'We preach Christ crucified,' (2) The Catholic Church, (3) The 1662 Tradition, (4) Such modern developments, religious and scientific, as can be said to have made good, (5) liberal, rather than strictly legal, principles of interpretation, (6) Sympathetic approach to difficult individuals.

This is broadly what the bishops are doing now. There are differences of opinion about the extent to which they have done justice to modern developments, and the excess, or defect, of their sympathy to individuals. But in the main the six points mentioned describe their policy. If it gains the approval of public opinion, the question of discipline will largely solve itself.

There must be discipline in the Church. And this means that some things are commanded, and some things are forbidden. But the Navy and the Army are not complete parallels. Nor is the law. Though the language of rubrics and regulations must be made clear and logical, the Gospel is not the same thing as the law. The completely legal method is not desirable in the Church. The demand lately made that the revision of the Prayer Book should be accompanied, or even preceded, by disciplinary measures does not point the way to Christian order in a Christian Church. Acts

of Parliament like that of 1874, 'to put down Ritualism,' will never be any good.

The principle of the matter is that in the Church, as in a family, the less disciplinary action there is, the better. There is always in a good and happy family an admirable discipline, because in such a family all recognize their several stations and duties, and all use due considerateness and subordination. The absence of disciplinary action is evidence of the existence of good discipline. Every recourse to punishment is in itself a confession of failure, and helps very little, if at all. To use a homely metaphor to describe what is happily not characteristic of English homes, where father is always putting his foot down, the children are likely to get their backs up. And the Church of England will only be saved if it can live like a healthy and mutually considerate family.

It may be—there are grounds to fear it—that some Churchmen have definitely and finally adopted an interpretation of Christianity which is alien from the *ethos* of the Church of England. If so, they cannot permanently remain, unchanged, within its borders. But if the authorities pursue the line of asserting charitably but firmly the real character of the Church, and if the rank and file have as their guiding principle the idea of dutiful co-operation, whatever there may be of final incompatibility will eventually emerge. There will be no persecution, and only paternal pressure. But

if and when there comes a real parting of the ways, it will, wherever it is inevitable, be recognized by conscience that the time has come to take another road.

No one should ever be in a hurry to exclude himself. Still less should any one ever be in a hurry—the pages of ecclesiastical history are strewn with warnings against this—to exclude others. But the time may come when some who stand on the Romeward side of our boundaries—and some too who stand on the side that looks towards Geneva and the side where Modernism fades into something less than Christianity—will find themselves definitely out of place. Then they will go. It will be a loss in personnel. But, if truth is served, it will be a gain.

All this is future, and may never happen. In the meantime what is to be done to reassure the people of England? It is commonly believed, especially in the North of England, that large numbers of the clergy, and such congregations as have been led away by them, are halfway to Rome. The sort of casual comment that is made in mill or railway carriage or barber's shop is, 'If Mr. X is inclined towards the Catholics, let him go over to the Catholics, and not stay on false pretences in the Church of England.'

The suspicion is entirely without foundation. But it exists. Through an unhappy series of historical events, and (more recently) a variety

of errors, extravagances, prejudices, and abusive propaganda, the Church of England is misunderstood. Many 'sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England,' whose whole purpose has always been to obey the Prayer Book as the authoritative and greatly beloved manual of their own part of the Church, are accused of Romanizing. If their teaching or practice shews any kind of moderation, they are thought to be envious admirers of those fortunate persons who have attained to some more advanced mile-stone on the Romeward road.

The amount of truth in the first accusation is about as great as if it were said that Constable and Gainsborough were imitators of Bellini or Botticelli, or that Beveridge and Jeremy Taylor were only restrained by motives of prudence from going all the way with Cardinal Bellarmin. The answer to the second charge is that religion, like art, is catholic. Some English artists affect the Italian manner more than others. Those who are trying to assist in the further development of an English school regret that certain of the fellow-artists should be at pains to promote an unnatural, non-national style; but, while they admire the many excellences of the exotic productions of the philo-Roman school, their own chief concern is to follow the vocation which they conceive that they have themselves received of God.

This is indeed the remedy. The Church of

England must go on its way. It need not particularly concern itself with the Church of Rome. We cannot of course fail to be aware of the existence of that splendidly imposing fabric, with so much in its polity and method that is different from our own and so very much that is the same, in all parts of the world. We are interested in news from Rome, as good world-citizens in Europe or America are interested in the news that crosses the Atlantic. We are bound, in Christian honour, and in response to the Lambeth Appeal to all Christian People, to hope and pray and work for reunion all round, to miss no opportunity of Christian co-operation with Rome, as with the East, or with the Free Churches.

The ' Conversations ' at Malines were good as far as they went. They were only a very small beginning. Though the points of difference were not published, it is clear that even the approximations were not identities. And of course the discussions committed nobody. But it is a very happy thing that a few people on either side should have explored the ground and considered possibilities.

Yet in the main the Church of England is content to follow its own vocation. Perfectly aware of the real reasons for not being Roman Catholic, or Nonconformist ; ready at all times to present, whenever it may be required, an adequate defence against criticism from any quarter, it is at no time eager for controversy.

There was a stage, in the first throes of the Reformation, when the Church of England prayed in the Litany to be delivered 'from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities.' But that stage has long passed behind us. Quite recently the Coronation Oath, while remaining entirely adequate to defend what it was intended to defend, has been purged of its offensiveness. The Church of England has complete confidence, not indeed in itself—it has too much Christianity for that—but that its way in the long run is the right way, that it will yet prove to be, as it was hailed on all sides at Lausanne, a 'Bridge Church.'

The Church of England has lasted a long time; it had enough Evangelical penitence to accept the Reformation, and enough Catholic vitality to come through the Reformation without bankruptcy; it maintained its State-connection through the King Stork period of the sixteenth century and the King Log period of the eighteenth century, and yet never became quite unchristian; it has numbered among its members the leaders of society, and yet has never been quite poisoned with class-consciousness; it has had continuous relations with the law and Parliament, and yet with a strange simplicity has baffled the all-conquering lawyers and the complacent, unwinking Erastianism of its nursing-fathers at S. Stephen's.

A Church which has done all this has a future. It is likely enough that the actual

future of the Church of England will be, externally and legally, different from its past. But it will be the same in all that matters. The Church of England in 1978 will trace its Apostolical Succession back to the Church of England in 1928.

III

SOME AXIOMS

A GOOD test of a man's physical health is the condition of his heart. At the heart of the life of the Church is Holy Communion. The place of the Order of Holy Communion in the Prayer Book is like the place of the last few chapters of the four Gospels in the Gospels as a whole ; it is like the place of the four Gospels in the New Testament ; it is to other services what the Lord's Prayer is to other prayers. If it stands, they stand. If it fell, they would fall. A good diagnosis of the general health of any part of Christ's Church can be obtained by an examination of its Eucharistic faith and practice. The purpose and worth of the 1662 tradition can be most truly estimated by the liturgy which was then commended—and commanded—to the Church of England.

As it was in the general life of the Church, so it was in the condition of the heart. The inheritance left by the Prayer Book makers was not taken up. The morning of the Lord's Day has not been spent by English Churchmen as was then intended. The hope that out of every

twenty qualified persons in any parish 'four (or three at the least)' would be communicants at every Celebration has not been fulfilled. The parishioners soon ceased even to have many opportunities of fulfilling it. Communion services became more and more infrequent.

During the eighteenth century the idea of weekly participation was lost altogether. Matins, which was intended (*a*) to be said every day and (*b*) on Sundays and holy days at least to lead to the Eucharist, was said on Sunday only and became the regular Sunday morning service. Except in the cathedrals, it became on most Sundays the only morning service. And even in the cathedrals the majority of the congregation left the building at the exact point at which in ancient times the penitents and catechumens had been dismissed and the faithful had settled down to the proper and indispensable devotion of the Lord's Day.

Thus, the attempt to revive the Prayer Book method has had an air of novelty. And, more serious than that, it has had an air of partisanship. It is in fact neither of these things. But because it is so viewed, it is the point at which the issue must be argued out. Any attempt to estimate and exhibit the English Church tradition must, so to speak, specialize on the Eucharist. The English Church has a Eucharistic tradition, expressed in the Prayer Book, not novel, not partisan. It is congruous with, it is in fact a central and characteristic

element of, Anglican Church teaching. Accordingly, the remainder of this book will be devoted to an examination of the Prayer Book teaching on this subject. By it we stand or fall. We establish, or we fail to establish, our claim to present a Reformed and English version of the Catholic tradition.

It is a tragic thing that many Churchmen do not use, hardly even recognize, the best and greatest of their possessions. It is not indeed the only possession that they fail to use in full. Many of them under-value Baptism and Confirmation. But at least they have them. They have in point of fact received their regenerating and strengthening gifts. But Holy Communion is a gift that is intended to be received often. Many Churchmen frequently, almost habitually, deprive themselves of it. But it is worse that Holy Communion has become a badge of separation. The thing which should have been for our wealth is become an occasion of falling.

Holy Communion is that which keeps together, in real but limited fellowships, great numbers of Christians, all in fact who consent to be kept together by it. It quite obviously unites, there and then, the smaller fellowships, which actually join in it. And also, in a deeper sense which is quite real and, whenever they care to think of it, quite intelligible, it unites them with the whole of Christendom. It is a centre, a point of unity. But also it is that which keeps apart from one another great

numbers of Christians, all in fact who are unable to consent to be kept together by it. It is a point of disunion. The Sacrament of fellowship is itself a cause of separation.

It is a truth of physics that, when centripetal and centrifugal forces are equal, some kind of stability is ensured. In the physical world, stability is no doubt generally an advantage. But in this all-important region of the spiritual world the kind of stagnant stability produced by the pressure of equal and opposite forces is in no way desirable. Can anything be done ?

The purpose of the present discussion is limited and practical. It has not the high endeavour of attempting to commend Anglican teaching to Christians outside the Anglican border, or to persons outside any Christian borders. Such an aim, attractive as it is, would be impossible within the limits of a little book. A little book on a great subject is compelled to take for granted much which non-Anglicans could hardly be expected to concede. Our purpose is to examine Anglican doctrine, to see exactly what the Church of England appears to teach. Where does it leave us free ? What have we in common ? What still remains to be explored and worked out in friendly co-operation ? And the whole discussion is governed by the belief that, if we could agree about Holy Communion, we should agree about everything.

' We ' here means members of the Church of England. But it might even be said (though

this matter will not now be discussed) that, if all Christendom could agree about Holy Communion, it would agree about everything. That is the essential point of difference. The word that sticks in the throat of Nonconformists is 'priest.' And the term 'Anglican priest' is excluded from the vocabulary of Roman Catholics. But the reason in both cases is that the background of 'the priest' is 'the altar.' If it were possible for Roman Catholics and Nonconformists to believe that the Rector of X—— and the Vicar of Y—— were priests, the Great Church would be at hand. If we could agree about Holy Communion, we should agree about everything.

But, as was said before, the object of these pages is not the gigantic task of bringing together all Christian people. It is the more modest, though still the formidable, attempt to bring together the members of what is, for good or ill, the most varied and most comprehensive Church in Christendom. All such attempts are full of promise, because it is at the altar that we are in fact united. But they are difficult because it is in connection with the Sacrament of the Altar that we feel our differences most acutely.

One thing that must always be said on this great subject in the Church of England is in the nature of a warning. When Christian people are thinking about Holy Communion or discussing it, it is fatal to get angry. This is not

said because many members of the Church of England are in the habit of getting angry about it, but because there is among them considerable difference of conviction, and anger is the one thing that would be fatal to understanding. To use angry words about the Eucharistic beliefs of other people, to say things which are likely to make them angry, to be bitter or contemptuous, destroys all hope, not merely of agreement, but even of enlightenment. Not by those methods will the truth be reached. The only atmosphere in which any one in such a matter ever wins through to the truth of God, is the atmosphere of the peace of God. Let us then peaceably and in the sight of God endeavour to approach the truth.

A theological topic that must be handled is the theory of Transubstantiation. Transubstantiation does not really belong to Anglican teaching on the subject. But it is mentioned, and criticized, in one of the Thirty-Nine Articles, and it has been brought up so much of late in the Press and in conversation, that it must of necessity be discussed here.

Always, as soon as Transubstantiation has been mentioned, it becomes necessary to make clear that it is not the same thing as belief in the Real Presence. It is very commonly taken for granted that the two terms are equivalent and that the beliefs involved are identical. In the Prayer Book debate in the House of Com-

mons in December, 1927, this was freely assumed.

It is the same in common talk, and sometimes in print. When the Report of the Malines Conversations was published, it appeared that both sides had agreed in saying, 'In the Eucharist the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are verily and indeed given, taken, and received by the faithful. By consecration the Bread and Wine become the Body and Blood of Christ.' Many readers, seeing this, at once remarked, 'Ah yes, that is Transubstantiation.' It was a wholly erroneous assumption. Transubstantiation is a theory of the *manner* of our Lord's presence, so elaborate and so philosophical that it could not possibly be stated without the use of the word 'substance.' And of the Malines statement the first sentence is borrowed from the Church Catechism, with the addition of the single word 'given' from the twenty-eighth Article. The word 'become' in the second sentence is no doubt an attempt to re-express the meaning of the word 'is,' as it was used by our Lord and recorded by the Evangelists and by S. Paul.

Some people, impatient of clear thinking, will no doubt continue to maintain that the Anglican members of the Malines group committed themselves to belief in Transubstantiation. In fact, some people habitually maintain that any statement of belief in the Real Presence is inevitably Transubstantiation, and can only properly be

made by Roman Catholics. But the facts are against them.

What is the difference? That will appear later. But meantime, though illustrations are never adequate, it may perhaps be said that belief in the Real Presence is to Transubstantiation as the general belief that human nature is spiritual is to 'Epiphenomenalism,' 'Psychophysical parallelism,' or some other detailed scientific theory of man's nature. The one is the belief that the spiritual can, and in this particular instance does, use the material; and the other is a theory of the exact relationship between the spiritual and the material, of the point or line at which the spiritual leaves off and the material begins.

Or it might be said that Transubstantiation is like appending an official explanation to every chord and phrase of a Beethoven sonata, or the putting forward of what purports to be a final analysis of the character of Hamlet or Lady Macbeth. Nay more, it may even perhaps be compared to the promulgation by the Church of an official paraphrase of the Sermon on the Mount or the Lord's Prayer. All these tasks are constantly attempted up to a point by intelligent and cultured people for themselves. It is agreed that in every case there is a spiritual reality which can and should be explored. But we rightly shrink from tying ourselves to an official analysis.

Transubstantiation is a mediaeval theory.

The gist of it appears first in John of Damascus and in Paschasius Radbert in the eighth and ninth centuries. It was revived in the Berengarian controversy of the eleventh century. Berengar was made to recant his 'heresy'; and from that time the doctrine of Transubstantiation may fairly be regarded as the official doctrine of the Mediaeval Church, though the actual term was not officially adopted till the Lateran Council of 1215. For the arguments of the opponents of Berengar there is nothing to be said. For the position of the great Schoolmen, Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas, there was, at that time at least, a great deal to be said.

Their doctrine was worked out in this way. The Schoolmen, who were undoubtedly the best minds of their day, were Aristotelians in their philosophy. They directed the methods of Aristotle to the subjects of Christian theology. They were not creative, as S. Paul had been, as the great Fathers, Origen, Basil, or Augustine, had been, but they were consummate systematizers. One of their favourite categories was that of 'substance.' The word sounds in our ears very material. It was not, in fact, ever intended to have a materialistic meaning, any more than the word 'substance' in the Nicene Creed. The teaching of the Nicene Creed about the Son being 'of one substance with the Father' is probably sometimes thought by ignorant persons to refer to some material

substance. But all instructed Christians know that 'substance' in the Creed means something purely metaphysical, something which could also be expressed in the words 'essential nature.' Thus, the 'substance' of God means the essential nature, or deity, of God. The teaching of the Creed is simply that the Son is as divine as the Father is Himself. In the same way, the word 'substance,' as contained in the word 'transubstantiation,' was not intended to be in the smallest degree, or in any sense, materialistic. Of all possible categories, that of substance seemed to the Schoolmen the most purely spiritual, and was adopted by them as such.

The metaphysical theory dominant in the philosophy of that epoch, not only in the particular department of theology, but in all thought about the universe, was that every existing thing consisted of (*a*) accidents, that is, physical characteristics, shape, size, texture, taste, hardness or softness, and so forth, and also of (*b*) substance, that essential, imponderable, unmeasurable, imperceptible, metaphysical quality which made the thing to be what it was. At that time crude and repulsive theories about the Sacrament were prevalent among ignorant people. It was asserted, for example, that when a consecrated Host was once by accident pierced with a sword, red blood was seen to flow from it. Such stories occasioned no surprise among the ignorant.

The Scholastic theologians, devout and spiritual men, were eager to explain the mystery of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, about which they had no shadow of doubt, in some intelligent and spiritual way. Being themselves philosophers, they explained the effect of the consecration of the bread and wine at the Eucharist according to the best philosophy of their time. If they were over-curious and over-exact, it was the fault of their day and method. Standing on Catholic ground, which they felt sure that they could trust, and using the reason which they believed to be the best gift of God to man, they probed all things in heaven and earth with a remorseless logic.

Thinkers to-day are more modest, less purely logical, and also not disposed to grant the presuppositions from which the Schoolmen began. But it is undeniable that the Schoolmen reasoned with great power according to their light. And they taught that by the act of Consecration the 'substance' of the bread and wine ceased to exist, and was transformed into the 'substance' of the Lord's Body and Blood. The 'accidents,' that is, all the physical properties of the bread and wine, remained exactly as they had been. The bread was still bread, not only in its colour, texture, and so forth, but in its capacity to serve as food for the bodies of men, and in its liability to decay.

This doctrine held the field for centuries. Rightly handled, it was a protest, a well-inten-

tioned protest, and to a large extent a successful protest, against gross and carnal theories. It seemed to the devout and scientific minds of Peter and Thomas both irreverent and foolish to suppose that Christ actually moved from His heavenly station and came down upon the altar. As handled by the Schoolmen, it was a spiritual doctrine, and also unquestionably in accordance with accepted philosophy. But the teachers of the later Middle Ages were not good theologians. The Mediaeval Mass spoke, as the Roman Mass does to this day, of the Host as *panis* even after Consecration. But 'substance,' a dangerous word in either Latin or English in the Creed, was ten times more dangerous in Eucharistic theology. Article twenty-eight is abundantly justified in saying that the doctrine of Transubstantiation 'hath given rise to many superstitions.'

The doctrine did good service in its time. But it has had its day. And even apart from gross misunderstandings and superstitions, which obviously lie close at hand, modern thinkers have ceased entirely to define the universe or anything in it in the mediaeval terms of substance and accidents. And if they could use those categories, they would still be unable to conceive of accidents as existing apart from their substance. Bishop Gore describes the doctrine as one 'which regards the supernatural presence as annihilating its natural vehicle except in mere appearance.' And the

Bishop of Manchester has said : ' The doctrine had become to us very difficult to understand, and, I venture to say, quite impossible to hold, because the terms in which it was formulated no longer represent the way in which any human being thinks.'

But in the sixteenth century there were many to whom the doctrine did not seem dead. Even Luther, for all his reforming zeal, could not completely emancipate himself from the old mediaeval modes of thought. His theory was that of ' Consubstantiation,' the belief that after Consecration there were present in the Sacrament (1) the accidents of bread and wine, (2) the substances of bread and wine, and (3) the substances of the Body and Blood of Christ. And at the Council of Trent, reforming council though it was in many ways, the doctrine of Transubstantiation was solemnly reaffirmed as the official doctrine of the Roman Church. The Roman Catholics are tied to it.

What do they mean by it ? Do they maintain a purely spiritual view ? Is it still a protest against gross theories ? Or do they believe in a local and physical presence ? It is impossible for an outsider to know what is believed by the rank and file. But even if it be assumed that the teaching given by the clergy and in schools is always well-informed and careful, it seems not improbable that Processions of the Host and the language sometimes held about the ' Prisoner of the Tabernacle,' ' Visits to Jesus,'

and so forth, produce in many of the less-educated minds a simple, enthusiastic, but sub-Christian belief in a local presence, created by the priest, which occurs nowhere else but at the altars of their Church, but is there a daily miracle.

But the teaching of their best theologians is clearly spiritual. Here, for example, is a famous sentence from Cardinal Newman, which has surprised many : ' Our Lord neither descends from heaven upon our altars, nor moves when carried in procession. The visible species change their position, but He does not move. He is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of a spirit.' The language reminds us very remarkably of one of our own Articles—' only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.'

It may in practice be difficult for the less-instructed members of the Roman Catholic Church at all times to remember and accept the careful teaching of their best theologians. And teachers may be tempted to acquiesce for practical reasons in the existence of crude beliefs which they would themselves repudiate. But there is no doubt about the teaching of the theologians. Given—it is a large assumption, and in the twentieth century impossible to grant—the Scholastic philosophy, the doctrine of Transubstantiation is, in the hands of theologians, unobjectionable.

But the Scholastic philosophy has broken down. The intellectual conclusion from this

is that Transubstantiation, always over-subtle and dangerous, must now be considered a useless explanation. And the moral is that it is always a very great error for the Church to be tied to any specific explanation, to say that Christianity *consists* of this or that, is only to be explained in this or that way.

Let us take two parallel examples, from Science and from Politics. A modern Christian accepts, let us say, the theory of Evolution. But the time may well come when the thought of the world will have moved on, and some conception more accurate and more worthy than that of evolution will have been found to explain the manner of God's creation of the world. It is therefore a very good thing that the Apostles' Creed does not make us say, 'I believe in God the Father Almighty, Who, by the method known as evolution, has been and is the Maker of heaven and earth.' Again, a modern Christian might be in politics either a Fascist or a Socialist. It is conceivable that one of those two political theories might be the wisest theory for Englishmen to follow at this date. But, if he believed in either of them as the political theory which should now be approved by Christian Englishmen, he must never say that Christianity *consists* of Fascism or Socialism, as the case might be, and can only function along those lines.

It is a very dangerous thing ever to tie your Gospel to any earthly explanation. Thought

moves on, and you are left, tied to your antiquated theory. Transubstantiation is not in itself, as is commonly supposed, a carnal theory. But it is dangerously open to abuse ; it is over-analytical ; it is, in some of its later developments (which need not be considered here, but must be faced by those who adopt it as their doctrine) distressingly and morbidly analytical ; and the modern mind has ceased to believe the philosophy from which it took its terminology.

In any case the theory does not particularly concern us. It is condemned by the twenty-eighth Article of Religion, and it may be excluded from further consideration. It is excluded in the same sort of way as is the view which is commonly called 'Zwinglianism.'

Zwingli was a Swiss divine of the sixteenth century. His view was that the Lord's Supper was nothing more than a Memorial of the Lord's Death. The worshippers sit in their places in church, they think devoutly about the Upper Room, and they receive bread and wine in memory of Christ's Death.[1]

There are some members of the Church of

[1] Reputations are always being refurbished, and it has lately been suggested that Zwingli was not a Zwinglian. Perhaps he has been misjudged. Let us hope so. But even if what is called Zwinglianism lacks his authority, there are some to-day who profess to hold a barely commemorative doctrine of the Lord's Supper. And I suggest that, wherever there is devotion, their faith is richer than their verbal creed.

England who imagine that they hold this conviction, who say, 'I conceive that the Sacrament is only a Memorial of Christ's Death.' But it is very difficult to believe that they have analysed their own experience aright. Priests who have given Communion to such persons, and have observed their reverent demeanour, would probably assert with some confidence that, of those at least who fulfil the Prayer Book minimum requirement of communicating three times in the year, there is not one who is a real 'Zwinglian.' They believe more than they believe themselves to believe. But, if there are any 'Zwinglians'—and among the people who present themselves at the altar so unexpectedly at Easter, and at Easter only, there may be some—their doctrine is not that of the Church of England. Transubstantiation and 'Zwinglianism' may both be excluded for those who wish to be guided by the teaching of that Church. The teaching of the Prayer Book and of the Anglican tradition is something quite different from either of them. It repudiates the Transubstantiation theory, and it does not teach or encourage, or in any way sanction, the doctrine of the Real Absence.

We are now ready to consider certain beliefs which may be properly held and taught in the Church of England. This will involve some detailed theological treatment. But in the meantime this much of general observation may

be made. There is one principle on which all Christians must surely be agreed. There should be in all of us the desire to believe whatever may be true. It is right to wish to believe exactly what our Lord means us to believe. The way is not first to invent your own theory and then claim His sanction for it, but to believe precisely what Christ seems to you to be saying about it, whatever that may be. A note of true discipleship is willingness to 'follow the Lamb, whithersoever He goeth.' It is the note of adventurous discipleship. There are always some Christians to whom the Catholic Faith will seem to be a thing already given, and some to whom it will seem a thing that is yet to be discovered. Both are right, and willingness to follow the Lamb is that which they should have in common. To follow the Lamb, a certain, sure crusade—and yet, to follow whithersoever He goeth.

Two familiar quotations will indicate the bearing of this principle on Eucharistic doctrine. There is the verse attributed to Queen Elizabeth :

> Christ's was the word that spake it;
> He took the bread and brake it,
> And what that word did make it,
> That I believe and take it.

The implication is obvious. There is no dogmatizing. The proper course is to wish to believe whatever is Christ's truth.

The other illustration is a prayer : 'Grant unto us all, and especially to those whom Thy providence hath in any wise entrusted with the treasure of Thy holy doctrine among us, Thy good Spirit, always so to believe and understand, to feel and firmly to hold, to speak and to think, concerning the mystery of the communion of the Body and Blood of Thy dear Son, as shall be well-pleasing to Thee and profitable to our souls.' Here again is no *a priori* dogmatizing. The prayer desires that we may believe the truth, whatever it may be. The author of it is John Keble.

Next, there are two actual positions of fundamental importance on which there is throughout the whole of the Church of England universal agreement. The first is this. There is in the Sacrament as a whole a real presence of Christ, whatever be the precise connection of that presence with the elements. Mark the words 'in the Sacrament as a whole.' We do all, without exception, believe that through this ordinance our Saviour communicates His life to us. Of that there is no doubt among us. An overwhelming array of quotations could be adduced from Anglican writers of all dates and kinds, from Hooker onwards, and also in fact from non-Anglicans, like Baxter or R. W. Dale, which would amply prove the truth of this statement. It must be enough here to refer to a very few.

(*a*) There is a famous hymn by Charles

Wesley, beginning 'Victim Divine' (*A. & M.*, 556). The last verse is :

We need not now go up to heaven
To bring the long-sought Saviour down ;
Thou art to all that seek Thee given,
Thou dost e'en now Thy banquet crown :
To every faithful soul appear,
And shew Thy real presence here.

Other hymns could be quoted, by various writers, which are used and loved by communicants of all shades of belief. Thus :

My God, and is Thy table spread,
And doth Thy Cup with love o'erflow ?
Thither be all Thy children led,
And let them all Thy sweetness know.

Hail, Sacred Feast, which Jesus makes,
Rich banquet of His Flesh and Blood !
Thrice happy he who here partakes
That sacred stream, that heavenly Food.

Or :

Bread of Heaven, on Thee we feed,
For Thy Flesh is meat indeed ;
Ever may our souls be fed
With this true and living Bread ;
Day by day with strength supplied
Through the life of Him Who died.

Vine of Heaven, Thy Blood supplies
This blest Cup of Sacrifice ;
Lord, Thy wounds our healing give,
To Thy Cross we look and live :
Jesus, may we ever be
Grafted, rooted, built in Thee.

Or, once again :

We come, obedient to Thy word,
To feast on heavenly Food ;
Our meat the Body of the Lord,
Our drink His precious Blood.

(*b*) Dr. Moule, Bishop of Durham, was one of the great leaders of the more Evangelical section of the Church of England. He wrote :

I believe that if our eyes, like those of Elisha's servant at Dothan, were opened to the unseen, we should indeed behold our Lord present at our Communions. There and then assuredly, if anywhere, and at any time, He remembers His promise, 'Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them.' Such special presence, the promised congregational presence, is perfectly mysterious in mode, but absolutely true in fact, no creation of our imagination or emotion, but an object for our faith. I believe that our Lord, so present, not on the Holy Table, but at it, would be seen Himself in our presence, to bless the Bread and Wine for a holy use, and to distribute them to His disciples, saying to all and each, 'Take eat, this is My Body which was given for you.' 'Drink ye all of this ; this is My Blood of the New Covenant which was shed for you for the remission of sins.' I believe that we should worship Him thus present in the midst of us in His living grace, with unspeakable reverence, thanksgiving, joy, and love.

(*c*) Even more important, and more conclusive, is the language of the Book of Common Prayer.

'The benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament (for then

we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood ; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us ; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us).' 'Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed by His most precious Blood.' 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.' 'Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ.' 'The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.'

This is a fundamental point of agreement. The Methodist singer, the Evangelical theologian, the Book of Common Prayer, unite to teach a real presence of Christ in the Sacrament as a whole. No one believes that the Lord is absent at the solemn hour when we obey His ordinance and draw near in His Name.

Another point of agreement is this. We are all, without exception, agreed that a living faith (in the old-fashioned language of the Prayer Book, a 'lively faith') is essential. No Christian ever supposes that the mere physical reception of the elements, without any spiritual welcome to the spiritual gift, conveys any blessing to the soul. A living faith is essential. A spiritual gift cannot be received by any

other means than by faith. It would not be possible. Faith is the only organ which ever could receive a spiritual gift. So the Revised Prayer Book puts these words on to our lips immediately after Communion : 'Having now by faith received the precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ.' So Article twenty-eight says : 'The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.'

Quite plainly the gift, being of a spiritual nature, could not possibly be apprehended by the physical organs. Nor, of course, could the gift, being of a spiritual nature, be measured by scientific instruments. It could not, any more than it could ever be ascertained, by instruments or by analysis, whether or not a certain person had been confirmed. Or than the difference in moral character between any two human beings could be measured by scientific apparatus. If there is any difference between the confirmed and the unconfirmed, or between the characters of two men, it must be ascertained by other means.

This necessity of faith is of course no modern discovery. It is not even a specially Reformed doctrine, although the Reformation did a great service in recalling it. It is part of universal Christianity. Dr. J. B. Mozley's examination

of the teaching of the Fathers is thus summed up by Bishop Gore :

> The Fathers held the objectiveness, as we now call it, of the inward part, or thing signified, in the Sacrament. But at the same time they held that the Body and Blood of Christ could not be eaten except by faith, which was the medium by which alone this spiritual food had any operation or function as food. To suppose that a man's natural mouth and teeth can eat a spiritual thing is a simple confusion of ideas.

It appears, then, that in certain exclusions, on the ruling principle, and on two great specific points of Eucharistic theology—that there is in the Sacrament as a whole a real presence of Christ, so that He Himself therein really gives us His own life, and also that on our part a living faith is essential—we are in the Church of England perfectly agreed.

At this point it might be thought that we could stop, as in fact a great many loyal Churchmen do. But that which may be lawful for an individual is not expedient, is not possible, for the Church, or for any inquiry into the teaching of the Church. And this for two reasons. In the first place, the subject has a history. And in the second place the most thoughtful Christians are compelled to ask themselves questions about the nature of their belief.

IV

SOME THEORIES, AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

THERE are, apart from Transubstantiation and 'Zwinglianism,' three ways of attempting to understand the Sacrament. They do not, as is sometimes supposed, of necessity and altogether exclude one another. All are legitimate within the Church of England. But in regard to all of them there are several things to be remembered :

1. Not any one of them is the official theory. The Church of England has no official theory about the Eucharist, any more than it has about the Atonement, or about the inspiration of Holy Scripture.

2. Not any one of them is in the strict sense a theory at all. That is to say, not any one of them is, like Transubstantiation, a theory of the *manner* of our Lord's presence.

3. Let it always be remembered that the thing itself is much more important than any man's theory about it.

And (4) a great many of the communicants of the Church of England have never attempted

and are never likely to attempt to put their theory into words.

Let us take first what is called Receptionism. (It is impossible to avoid using technical terms, however much they grate on the devout ear.) The theory of Receptionists is that the special presence of our Lord's Body and Blood is in faithful receivers. This is, as far as it goes, unquestionably true. It is, as we have seen, one of the two points on which we are all perfectly united.

But the great contribution of Receptionists to the truth about the Sacrament is not so much intellectual as devotional. The gift is what it is, what God makes it. This cannot be either damaged or improved by man. There is, as we shall see later, a place, a large place, for the pondering of the sanctified intelligence on the nature of the gift. But always the thing that devotionally matters most is the thing that man can control, can strengthen, and can spiritualize. That is his own attitude. No one supposes that a devout peasant fails to receive what Christ is willing to confer because he has a poor understanding and a limited vocabulary. The gift of Christ is not lessened, is not even affected by things of that kind. But to fail, through sloth or selfishness, in a response that could be given, is a peril to all of us. To overcome that peril takes all our strength. To have failed, once, twice, or many times, to overcome it

makes us—or should make us—humble and more trusting.

In calling attention to the truth that 'God dwells with him that is of a contrite and humble spirit,' that 'the Lord is nigh unto them that are of a contrite heart, and will save such as be of an humble spirit,' Receptionists are calling attention to what has always marked Christian teaching, and especially Christian sacramental teaching—its profoundly ethical character. It would have been so easy for the teaching, in other than Christian hands, to attribute to the Sacraments a mechanical efficacy. But in view of what Receptionists (not of course alone, but always among the most eager of ethical, prophetic teachers) keep constantly before the mind of the Church, it is impossible for this to happen.

It has been said (it sounds strangely in English ears, but it has been said by Continental scholars) that S. Paul assigned to Sacraments a sort of *ipso facto* value. If he ever seems to, it is only because he takes the response for granted. That belief in the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper was integral—perhaps even central—to his teaching is clear enough. As a rule he assumes their existence and their spiritual necessity, without staying to labour what all knew. When he was unhappily obliged to lay again foundations which had been laid, he used very grave, soul-stirring words about the fruits of Baptism

and the peril of irreverent Communion. But that he ever had a thought of either Sacrament in his mind without also thinking of the spiritual challenge which they make to character and the spiritual response which they demand in prayer and life, is not for a moment credible. To emphasize the necessity of faith, as indeed of penitence and charity, is imperative and indispensable. It follows from the whole teaching of both S. Paul and of the Prayer Book ; it is taught by our Lord's miracles of healing, by His unwillingness to quench the dimly-burning flax, and yet His strict intention to require much of those to whom much has been given ; it is of a piece with the whole spirit of the Christian Gospel.

When it has been said, and then said again, and yet again, and underlined, and proved in the lives of the communicants, that the response is the essential opening of an only door, that, if we ' so receive,' He dwells in us and we in Him, is there more to be said ?

To this there are three answers. There is (*a*) first the answer of Richard Hooker, that it is not for us to inquire too curiously into the relation between the elements and the gift :

> The bread and cup are His Body and Blood, because they are causes instrumental, upon the receipt whereof the participation of His Body and Blood ensueth. . . . The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament.

Hooker is the great example of setting aside the questions that begin with 'How,' and it is worth noticing that he uses the words 'is to be sought for in the worthy receiver,' not 'is in the worthy receiver.' Hooker's position is in many respects characteristically Anglican. It is also characteristically Elizabethan. He wrote at a time when the old Scholastic text-books and the old Scholastic arguments had just been laid aside, and the pioneer work of the first teachers of Anglicanism, as an independent variety of Catholic theology, was feeling its cautious way into the unknown future. But the richness of the devotional conclusion that he drew from his sober and reserved theology is clear from the following passage :

Let it therefore be sufficient for me presenting myself at the Lord's table to know what there I receive from Him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth His promise ; let disputes and questions, enemies to piety, abatements of true devotion, and hitherto in this cause but over patiently heard, let them take their rest ; let curious and sharp-witted men beat their heads about what questions themselves will, the very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security that these mysteries do as nails fasten us to His very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force, and virtue, even the Blood of His gored side, in the wounds of our Redeemer we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, our hunger is satisfied and our thirst for ever quenched ; they are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and unheard of which he uttereth,

whose soul is possessed of this Paschal Lamb and made joyful in the strength of this wine, this bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold, this cup hallowed with solemn benediction availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body, in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving, with touching it sanctifieth, it enlighteneth with belief, it truly conformeth us unto the image of Jesus Christ ; what these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the Body and Blood of Christ, His promise in witness hereof sufficeth, His word He knoweth which way to accomplish ; why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, O my God, Thou art true ; O my soul, thou art happy.

(*b*) Dr. Barnes on the other hand is quite sure that, when a rather meagre Receptionist doctrine has been stated, there is no more to be said. In his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in October, 1927, he asserts a definite negative. His words are :

The real presence of Christ can be with His followers in public worship. He is present wherever two or three are gathered in His Name.

A special solemnity attaches to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, inasmuch as for most Christians the sense of Christ's presence is then strengthened. For such it is a Sacrament, the 'fellowship meal,' the communion 'with each other and the Lord.'

There is no *objective* real presence of Christ attached to the bread and wine used in Holy Communion.

It may be noted in passing that the word 'objective' (like the word 'real,' which will be discussed in a later chapter) is often supposed to have a physical meaning. But this is a conclusion which no thinker who takes what is called a spiritual view of the universe can possibly allow. If God is the Creator, the ultimate reality is Spirit. Dr. Barnes of course knows well that the words 'objective' and 'real' have a metaphysical meaning, and therefore it seems that he intends here to assert a real absence of Christ from the elements themselves.

Elsewhere in the same letter he uses stronger language: 'Spiritual grace is given, not to the elements which are its vehicles, vehicles of the spiritual grace in the Sacrament of the Holy Communion, but to the worshipper who takes, eats, and drinks as he comes with faith and prayer and love to Christ.' The word 'vehicles' is significant. It is a stronger word than 'channels.' Dr. Barnes in yet another context has spoken of a great variety of means—'circumstances, places, writings, men'—as 'channels or instruments of the grace of God.' To say that Holy Communion is in that general sense a channel which Christ uses to reach our souls, and to say no more than that, would be a very inadequate description. But a 'vehicle' seems to mean a thing which actually conveys that of which it speaks. It is what Article twenty-five calls an 'effectual sign,' 'by the which God doth work invisibly in

us,' a sign which really effects, really brings to you, that of which it is the sign. Accordingly, it appears that even Dr. Barnes, who holds perhaps the bare minimum of Eucharistic doctrine which is legitimate within the Church of England, is himself not quite content with blank negation.

(*c*) There is a further answer, of a more positive kind. It is in any case evident that we cannot be content with the ground that has been covered up to now. Other questions arise, and must be considered. It may be that we shall find that they have never yet been solved ; it may be that we shall be reduced to pronounce them insoluble. We may be driven back to Receptionism, to the rich and glowing form of it, theologically unfinished but devotionally satisfying, that we find in Hooker, or to other, barer forms of it. But some doctrine of the Real Presence will have to be considered.

Meantime, there is a warning and a suggested compromise. The warning is that negatives are always dangerous. It has often been noted that in controversy men are apt to be right where they affirm, and wrong where they deny. Sweeping negatives are precarious things. Is any one but God entitled ever to assert a universal negative ?

When people say, ' Nature to me is a sacrament,' or, ' Every meal to me is a sacrament,' that, if a fact, is excellent. When they go on,

as they sometimes do, to say, 'Therefore I never, or very seldom, go to Holy Communion,' or, 'Therefore I interpret Holy Communion as nothing more than a kind of indoor sunset, or as the family meal received, on a larger scale, with more solemnity and special memories, in church,' that is not a sensible conclusion. The sensible conclusion would be to say, 'Everything is sacramental, and therefore, for those who believe in Christ, who believe that the Upper Room and the Cross have spiritual significance, the crown of the whole sacramental process is this Sacrament of the Gospel.'

The suggested compromise is what is known as Virtualism, the theory that the elements, when consecrated, have the virtue or efficacy of the Lord's Body and Blood. The teaching of Richard Hooker would be much more truly described as Virtualism than as what is now commonly meant by Receptionism. Indeed, in view of the fact that in his exposition of the doctrine of Church and Sacraments he takes as his starting-point the doctrine of the Incarnation, it is evident that he has no intention of omitting all thought of the relation between outward part and thing signified. He would not consider the gift altogether apart from the elements any more than in expounding the Person of Christ he would define the Logos and forget the human Flesh. He does not of course simply equate the Incarnation and the Eucharist. But his doctrine of the Sacrament

is much more than psychological. It is genuinely sacramental.

Virtualism is in some respects a characteristically Anglican theory. It represents the sort of view that prevails at committees, the view which says, in effect, 'Can we not have the advantage of the more definite position, without committing ourselves to statements which may hereafter be brought up against us?' It is in the old Whig tradition. And, just as the old political Whiggery has parted asunder and has gone in two different ways, so this theory may be in fact almost equivalent to either Receptionism or belief in the Real Presence. If you are a Virtualist and believe that the consecrated elements have, or can have, in Communion, the efficacy of the Body and Blood of the Lord, then clearly you are stressing the importance of faithful reception. On the other hand, Virtualism may amount to very much the same as belief in the Real Presence, because nowadays it is usual to think of reality in relation to persons. With an Idealist philosophy, and the Christian belief that Christ does give a gift through the Sacrament, the line between 'virtual,' 'effective,' and 'real' would be difficult to draw or to maintain.

Virtualism is the belief of a great many very devout people. It is certain that not only intense prayerfulness but an acute sense of the indispensable value of Communion for the life of the soul can co-exist with Virtualist theology.

In fact, it might be said that the higher forms of Virtualism in effect go all the way with belief in the Real Presence, except that Virtualists would probably shrink more from extra-liturgical devotions. The divine credit on which they bank fearlessly for the purpose of Communion would probably seem to them definitely limited to the declared intention of the original foundation-deed.

The conclusion is that Virtualism is in practice wonderfully effective, and may in fact be true. But it would be premature to close the inquiry at this point.

We pass on, therefore, towards some doctrine of the Real Presence. Not yet straight to it, but towards it. Virtualism and even Receptionism both make it necessary to have some further view about the relation of the gift to the elements. There are a number of reasons for which it seems impossible to stop at any theory which is Receptionist only, which concerns ourselves alone. Thus, no one supposes that man creates the gift. It comes in any case from God, and the word 'reception' carries you on not merely to thought of the quarter from which the gift comes, but to thought of the means wherein it is embodied.

S. Paul says that the Corinthians are to blame for 'not discerning the Lord's Body.' It would be unreasonable to blame people for failing to discern that which is not, in some sense, there already. No one, who has any real experience

of Christian worship, would think it adequate to go to church and at the time of Communion to remain in his place and receive some private, unconsecrated bread and wine of his own providing. Whatever your explanation, it is the receiving of the elements which is in fact the point of contact. Whatever it is that happens, it happens to you when you receive the elements. As Hooker says, they are 'causes instrumental,' the instruments through which the contact is effected. If it be allowed that faithful response is essential before the complete co-operation can come to pass, yet it seems that the gift must have some existence and some relation to the elements, an existence and a relation which are prior to, and not created by, the faith of the communicants.

There is, then, more to be said. An examination of the doctrine of the Real Presence cannot be avoided. But we shall not come to it till the next chapter. There are still some preliminary considerations.

Various illustrations have been used of things to which may be given in different ways a symbolic value. One such is the coin or cheque or bank-note, which by virtue of certain marks printed on it has a worth more than that of its 'very natural substance.' It is, up to a point, a valid illustration. The object is, in a sense, dynamic. It can even be said to have a spiritual value, because money is used to embody the purposes of mind. But the coin is not a

parallel to the Sacrament, because the recognition of the value of the coin depends upon a convention, general indeed, but artificially created, and because the token, to have value, requires to have been visibly differentiated from other pieces of metal. Better in some respects is the illustration of the flag or personal relic. The flag that was carried at the head of men now dead, by a man who died to save it from capture by the enemy, has a significance to informed and appreciative minds ; the coat which was worn by Nelson at Trafalgar, through which the shot came that ended his frail, heroic life ; the Prayer Book which was used by some martyred missionary ; a Family Bible marked by the loving fingers of our fathers who begat us and their fathers who begat them — all these have gathered to themselves associations very deep and very wonderful.

Then, it is also necessary to do justice to the following considerations :

1. The Lord Jesus is not only a character in the history of the past. He exists in the present. Some people, less than Christian, think of Him simply as a Person in a Book. His intrusion into the present is to them disturbing. It is not exactly that they think Him dead and done with. They do not actually speak, as the chief captain did, of 'one Jesus, Who was dead, Whom Paul affirmed to be alive.' It is rather that they suppose Him to

have preached His admirable sermons and to have inaugurated His well-meaning and on the whole praiseworthy Church, and then to have retired from active participation in its business. Of Christ as throned in heaven, Lord of the Church, which is His Body, Giver of grace, Himself in all grace the Living Gift, they have no notion. But Christians know that Christ is still alive. It does not surprise them to hear of Him breaking through into their lives, whether in the sacramental or in any other way.

2. Obedience is a virtue, perhaps the primary and fundamental virtue. 'Do this' is an order, and in mere obedience, even if fine feelings never come, if there is no rush of eloquent devotion, no rapture of high vision, there must be a blessing. 'This is My Body' is not an order, but it is a doctrine, clothed with authority. And 'if any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.'

3. It is reasonable to believe that the sacredness which has gathered round Holy Communion has a cause. Things do not take root, and grow, and perpetuate themselves, and survive superstition, controversy, and neglect, and make good their appeal with millions of truth-loving people, some indeed predisposed to welcome anything sacramental, but many of them inartistic, unimaginative, plain, ordinary men and women, unless God is in them. The

actual elements of bread and wine, if they had not been capable of being consecrated with a real blessing, would long since have been relegated to a place in the mystic gallery, where are the actual sword of the spirit, the actual shield of faith, and the actual helmet of salvation, and where on the painted walls of the devout imagination Christ still washes the disciples' feet. But this meal has wasted not, neither has the cruse of wine failed. They have endured, because they were made ready for consecration in a fire that once was kindled on the earth. Since then they have been everlastingly patient of the divine handling and everlastingly available for human needs.

4. Communicants have their own treasure of experience. It is for some a small treasure, and for some it has not been increased or even renewed for a long time. But such as it is, let it be weighed, and allowed to tell. And, if possible, let it be multiplied. The best way to grow towards an understanding of the Sacrament is to use it.

It may be asserted with some confidence that the experience of practically all Christians is to this extent the same : they are all afflicted by wandering thoughts, and find in themselves coldness and lack of devotion. They all find this. But they find it not so much at Communion as at other times. They know that Communion is the best thing they have in the Church. There is something in the necessity

of bodily movement, in the approach to the altar, in the kneeling side by side with others, in the holding out of perhaps not always eager but still humble hands, and in the simplicity of bread, which joins together the distant will of God and the personal response of the communicant. Let Christian people use this best thing they have. Let them use it a great deal more than most of them do now.

One great difference between primitive Christianity and modern Anglicanism is that the early Christians went to Communion every Sunday and most of us do not. Let us make better use of it. Let us put ourselves within its power. No theories are required at the beginning. They will come presently. The one thing required is willingness. And that, when analysed, resolves itself into repentance, faith, and charity with neighbours.

There are in the whole Sacrament three factors—Jesus the Saviour, Christian fellowship, which is the best of earthly things, and bread, which is the cheapest and commonest of foods. All comes from Jesus, the Real Consecrator ; all comes through Christian fellowship, the only atmosphere ; but all comes in the plain thing which is received.

5. Christian fellowship, the essential atmosphere, includes the laying aside not only of personal quarrels but of the controversial spirit. Unhappily considerable bitterness seems to be compatible with an acknowledgement that the

opponents are disciples of the same Master, members of the same Church. But it is less compatible with the practice of frequently sharing the same Sacrament. And here, while always it is the Lord Himself Who teaches, redeems, and builds up character, He does it, just where in the cause of charity it is particularly needed, through the outward form that shrines the inward part. To be loyal to the Lord, to love neighbours, and to do generous, overflowing justice to intellectual opponents, is a duty. But we fail in it, and the way in which our Lord brings it home to conscience is to make us eat His Bread with them. He that hath eaten bread with the Lord and His people will not, unless he is a very Judas, lift up the injurious heel. There may be differences, there may be great differences, of interpretation. But to have eaten bread at one Table with a Master and with fellow-guests reduces bitterness.

Finally, it may be said that there is no harm whatever, and perhaps much good, in discarding, at least for a time, all technical terms, and starting afresh. The Report of the Farnham Conference on Reservation contains a number of fresh and interesting suggestions towards a new understanding and a new terminology. Thus, among the terms proposed as possible by Canon Streeter was that of ' Real Puissance ' for ' Real Presence,' and among other tentative phrases put forward it was suggested that the

elements after Consecration might be described as 'charged with a new meaning,' 'charged with a new power,' or, 'instinct with the personality of Christ.'

In such experiments we are greatly helped by observing the language of devout Nonconformists. They are less bound by traditional phraseology than we are, more free to express themselves in simple, natural words. Sir Henry Lunn has brought together in *The Review of the Churches*, October, 1927, a whole series of their testimonies. A few may be quoted here.

Dr. A. S. Peake says :

> The Eucharist is in the first instance a commemoration of the death of Christ. I deprecate the description of this as a merely memorial view. There can be no such thing. . . . Much would be lost if we failed to dwell explicitly on the death of Jesus, the approach of which dominated the situation in the Upper Room.
>
> But our thought is not limited to the past. The Christ Whose death we commemorate is alive for evermore ; and it is from His pierced hands that we receive the living Christ ; not through transformation of the elements, but none the less really He gives that of which the elements are a symbol. This is the Sacrament of that mystical union of the believer with Christ, which is the inmost secret of the Christian experience and the ultimate source of the Christian victory, alike over sin and death. It is a communion between Christ and the soul unshared by any other, as though they were alone in the universe. But while it is thus intensely individual, it is also the sacrament of our corporate communion. We are lifted out of our isolation into

a universal fellowship. We know ourselves to be one with the vast army of the redeemed—the Church triumphant in heaven, the Church now militant on earth, the Church of those yet unborn, who in the long ages still to come are to carry on the living witness of the people of God. Such a consciousness is a wonderful inspiration.

I am not anxious to pit one form of divine grace against another, since all have their appropriate function. But the Eucharist has a unique value of its own. It speaks to our thought ; but since it speaks by action rather than word, it can gather about itself a richer fullness of meaning. It stirs within us the fountains of the great deep, partly because it touches us below the level of consciousness and arouses within us emotions which lie too deep, while we wait in silence, for words, and unseals springs of feelings which language may not reach.

The nemesis of exaggeration is undue depreciation. The reaction against what has been rightly felt to be false and extravagant has in many instances led to a poverty of conception and occasionally to a slovenliness of administration which has debased the spiritual quality and lowered the emotional temperature. A worthier view of the Sacrament and a more reverent type of service are greatly to be desired. It is a precious gift of God to His Church and a special channel of divine grace ; and the Real Presence of the Founder of the Feast is amply attested by the experience of recipients.

The Rev. Adolf Keller, D.D., of Zurich, says :

I was brought up in a Church which has always professed the most radical view in regard to the doctrine

of the Holy Communion—the Church of Zwingli. . . . In former years I remember how impressive it was to sit together in a church with a large congregation in silence and prayer thinking of the death of Christ and feeling united as members of His family. But the situation has considerably changed. To-day multitudes have lost the understanding for the deeper meaning of the Communion, and the masses no more feel as in former times towards the Lord's Supper. There may be different reasons for this change, but it may also be that this conception of the Communion as a mere memorial is also responsible for the deplorable quitting of the Lord's Table. I, for my part, am no more satisfied with Zwingli's doctrine. I owe a new understanding to my contact with the Church of Calvin, and also to the conception of what a sacrament means, which I found in the Church of England. A few days ago we, the members of the Life and Work Committee, celebrated the Holy Communion together in the Chapel of Farnham Castle—Anglicans, Lutherans, Reformed, and others. We all felt that, what is important and what unites us, is not what we think of the Holy Communion, but the heavenly mysterious gift of God's grace, the objective reality instead of the subjective interpretation, the act of God through Christ's Presence, and not the thought of men on it.

Pastor Wilfrid Monod, Honorary President of the National Union of Reformed Churches in France says :

Huguenot by tradition, brought up in the Reformed Church of France, a disciple of Calvin, of Zwingli, even, in the actual domain of the spirit, of George Fox, unfaltering in my filial devotion to them, I grow,

nevertheless, more sensible of the value of the Sacrament. On a recent visit to England, in the Chapel of the Castle of Farnham, I received the Communion from the Anglican Bishop of Winchester. I knelt between the Lutheran Bishop of Denmark and an American Presbyterian pastor. On this solemn occasion two certainties imposed themselves upon my soul with renewed force. First, that the Sacrament individualizes grace, and second, that it disintellectualizes religion. Therein are two great benefits. The first applies more especially to the humble, those that belong to the nameless crowd ; the second appeals to men collectively.

These testimonies from Free Churchmen are of extraordinary interest. They do not include any evidence from the Presbyterian quarter. This would be startling to many Anglicans in the range and depth of its content. Nor do they include any quotations from Dr. Orchard or others of the ' Free Catholic ' group, which would be still more surprising to those who are not familiar with recent theological history. But the evidence of Continental Protestants is, considering their history and their environment, very striking. And Dr. Peake is the ideal example of learned, devout English Nonconformity. It would be an exaggeration to say that his teaching is universally accepted. There are no doubt some in the Free Churches who have hardly passed beyond a blankly ' Zwinglian ' doctrine. But to an observant eye it is apparent that the Free Churches are to-day

everywhere attaching a greater importance to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and there is an increased desire to secure due reverence in its administration. It would not be fitting for an outsider to attempt to say how far this has led them, or how far it will lead them. But a tendency is obvious.

For the Church of England, is it extravagant to say that, among practically all who have a devout and regular experience as communicants, there does exist one of two convictions? Many are convinced that some doctrine of the Real Presence is inevitable and welcome. Others have not gone so far as that. But there is an increasing dissatisfaction with theories that concentrate attention on the human end, or with theories that evade the problem raised by the actual use of material elements, and an increasing tendency to move forwards in the direction of a stronger sacramental faith.

V

SPIRITUAL REALITY

COMMUNICANTS who are not content with Receptionist doctrine, or with the kind of Virtualist doctrine that inclines in that direction, do not always formulate their own additional beliefs. Very many of them greatly prefer not to do so, and have no intention of attempting it. And in the deepest sense of the word 'belief' it is no doubt impossible. We must all echo the words of Mr. Gladstone's hymn :

> O lead my blindness by the hand,
> Lead me to Thy familiar feast,
> Not here or now to understand,
> Yet even here and now to taste,
> How the Eternal Word of heaven
> On earth in broken bread is given.

This is devotionally satisfying. In fact, something of this sort—which can be called reserve or modesty or humility—is devotionally indispensable. 'Faith believes, nor questions how.' Yet there has been, and is, a Eucharistic theology. And among the doctrines that are legitimate within the Church of England is the

belief that after Consecration there is a true gift of our Lord's Body and Blood, and that this gift is not dependent on the faith of the recipients (though it can only be received by faith) but is in some way connected with the elements themselves. It is suggested that the experience of all communicants points in the direction of some such belief as this. No one supposes that the truth about the Eucharist can ever be perfectly expressed in words, any more than the truth about God can perfectly be so expressed. The sacramental principle itself forbids us to imagine that words are completely adequate. But just as some are bold enough to make modest affirmations about God, so some are bold enough to maintain a doctrine of a Real Presence.

The considerations that follow are partly of a general kind, and partly an examination of Anglican formularies. It is observable that in the discussion of any controversial matter in the Church of England, Eucharistic belief, or the propriety of sacramental confession or of Reservation, there are often two methods of approach. A number of elderly and middle-aged people are content to ask, 'Is it taught in the Prayer Book or the Articles?' But the young, at least the intelligent young, are often disposed to say, 'We do not care very much about that. The Church may be wrong. Its teaching may need altering. What we want to know is whether it is true.' It may be that

these young inquirers dismiss tradition, rubric, canonical obligation too light-heartedly. But there is great value in their penetrating view of the matter. The present chapter is intended to deal mainly with the questions that they ask, the following chapter with those of the older generation. To the writer it seems that the double treatment is essential.

It was remarked lately that, whereas belief in Transubstantiation does rest upon a philosophical foundation, however outworn, belief in the Real Presence rests on no philosophical foundation at all. This little book is not a philosophical treatise, and its desire is to appeal to ordinary Churchmen who have the Bible and Prayer Book in their hands, and ordinary intelligence. But it does not seem unfair to say that the reading of the author of that statement must have been very one-sided. Four reasons for this criticism can very briefly be suggested.

1. The doctrine of the Real Presence is not a philosophical theory of the manner of our Lord's presence. It is content to affirm the reality of the 'inward part, or thing signified,' and its inseparable connection, at any rate while the Sacrament is being used for Communion, with the 'outward part, or sign.'

2. One of the most remarkable chapters in the recent history of theology is the revival of belief in what is called 'Divine Immanence,' that is, the belief that God is not merely

Transcendent, but also Immanent, the force behind phenomena, the meaning of things, and that the whole universe is an expression of God's nature. On this much has been thought and said in recent years.

It is not a new doctrine. It comes from the New Testament and from the Nicene Creed ('by Whom'—in Greek, 'through Whom'—'all things were made'). But the thought of the eighteenth century was very hard and Deistic, and the return of belief in Divine Immanence, for which we are indebted on the one hand to theologians and on the other hand to many writers of the Nature School who did not perceive the whole value of what they did, has been a happy recovery of a too much neglected part of the Christian teaching about God. For those who appreciate its value, belief in the Incarnation, and in the sacramental principle, is made much easier.

3. There is a great school of philosophy which teaches that reality exists for the mind, and for the mind only. Idealism has always been difficult for the plain man to grasp. Boswell records a story of Dr. Johnson :

> After we came out of the church we stood talking for some time together of Bishop Berkeley's ingenious sophistry to prove the non-existence of matter, and that everything in the universe is merely ideal. I observed that, though we are satisfied that his doctrine is untrue, it is impossible to refute it. I shall never forget the alacrity with which Johnson answered, striking his foot

with mighty force against a large stone, till he rebounded from it, 'I refute it thus.' [1]

It may be that even the most thorough-going Platonists find it impossible always to be remembering their Platonism, and it may be that Berkeley was unduly academic, but can it be denied by thoughtful persons who believe in God that the universe holds together because it is held together in the mind of God? If God were for a moment to forget the world, the world would cease to have any existence.

Reality has also a relation to the human mind. It is only the mind that can perceive reality. Reality has even a relation with your own individual mind. You do not by thinking of a chair create that chair, but as you look at it, you put together in your mind various conceptions of height, breadth, shape, hardness, use, and so forth, and it is your capacity of combining into one whole those various conceptions that makes

[1] Mr. Augustine Birrell's footnote is: 'Dr. Johnson seems to have been imperfectly acquainted with Berkeley's doctrine: as his experiment only proves that we have the sensation of solidity, which Berkeley did not deny. He admitted that we had sensations, or ideas that are usually called sensible qualities, one of which is solidity. He only denied the existence of matter, i.e. an inert, senseless substance, in which they are supposed to subsist. Johnson's exemplification concurs with the vulgar notion that solidity is matter (Kearney). Dr. Birkbeck Hill appositely quotes a saying of Turgot's: "He who had never doubted of the existence of matter might be assured that he had no turn for metaphysical disquisitions"' (A. B.).

you able to utter the rational, and mystical, statement, 'That is a chair.'

If, therefore, the reality of any visible object is conditioned by its relation to mind, it can hardly be surprising to learn that the reality of a spiritual presence depends upon mind. Like any other presence, the Real Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament is created by the mind of God, and is apprehended by the minds of men.

4. Finally, there is a philosophic doctrine of values, which the Bishop of Manchester has done much to commend. It is not possible to do justice to it here. But briefly, it is the doctrine that religion has something of the quality of a science, but even more of the quality of an art. If you think of reality in terms of values, you will be prepared to agree that it is discernible not by simple perception, but by what is known as appreciation. Power of appreciation is not a natural possession of every human being. Some have more of it than others, and it can be educated. But it is generally allowed that appreciation of music, of poetry, of the interest of historic scenes, and so forth, is appreciation of a true thing, and an appreciation which it is desirable that all should either have and develop, or, failing that, should, if possible, obtain and develop.

These arguments have been mentioned very briefly, and it may be that they will seem difficult to those who are not familiar with

philosophy. But anyhow, this is the kind of philosophic basis on which belief in the Real Presence may be said to rest.

Let us now examine the meaning of the terms of this belief. First, the word 'presence.' It is a word for which it seems impossible to find a substitute. And yet many of us would like to find a substitute, if we could. Because 'presence' inevitably has a local sound. It seems to mean 'here and therefore not there,' or 'here and therefore not elsewhere.'

Those who use the word do not at all wish to suggest locality; at least no more than is unavoidable. No Christian can possibly believe that the Ascended Christ, Who with the Holy Ghost is most high in the glory of God the Father, ever occupies space in a church or in any other place in the created universe. But what can you say? The terms of space, like those of time, are not strictly applicable at all to the mode of existence of the Divine Being. But we live under conditions of space and time, and if we wish to affirm that the Lord Jesus makes through a particular rite a true contact with our spirits, we have to say something like 'present here,' just as we have to say something like 'present now.' Dr. Moule says, 'Not on the Table.' But his own amended version is, 'Not on the Table, but at it.' The words of space and time are not worthy to describe the operations of God's grace, but they are the only words we have. We need not actually

say 'Present here,' because that, as it were, underlines the suggestion of spatial locality, and is therefore doubly dangerous. But it is hard to see how we can express our belief in 'Immanuel,' 'God with us,' without using the word 'presence.'

Next, the word 'real.' It is much more important than the word 'present.' It may be that 'true' would be better, and 'true spiritual' or 'real spiritual' better still. The word 'actual,' though it is sometimes heard in descriptions of what others are alleged to believe, is not one of the recognized terms of sacramental theology. But either 'real' or 'true' is indispensable, though the terms are often misunderstood.

Many seem to think that 'real' must mean earthly, physical, material, and that belief in the Real Presence involves belief in some presence of that kind, something, in fact, that is ascertainable by scientific methods—weighing, measuring, analysing, or the like. But Christians cannot possibly agree that the word 'real' must mean earthly. They are absolutely committed to the belief that the things which are unseen, intangible, things like love, honour, faith—and also things like pride and envy—are more real than chairs and tables. They cannot possibly agree that 'real' has an earthly meaning. The word must not be dropped because some degrade it.

A layman said lately to a clergyman, who had

given him in two or three sentences his own method of approach to this great subject: 'Yes, I see what you mean. But you will never persuade hard-headed business men to think in that mystical way.' The reply was: 'It may be difficult, but as a Christian minister I must go on trying. I have to preach a great many things which people do not find it easy to accept. I have to tell my hearers that kind hearts are more than dividends, and simple faith than Daimler cars. Reality is not measured by outward appearance or cash value. A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth. My hearers do not always believe this. But I have to go on saying it.' We must never be intimidated into believing that 'real' means 'earthly.'

Next, the word 'spiritual.' What does that mean? Here we touch the centre and crux of the whole matter. Just as with the word 'real,' a great many seem to suppose that the spiritual grace of God is, to borrow a sentence from Dr. Kenneth Mozley, 'a kind of invisible fluid which passes into objects, and effects results by contact'; that it is like an electric current, for example, something very thin, very fine, very impalpable, but still in the last resort material. But no instructed Christian has ever believed that for a moment. Grace is simply 'God in action.'

The theory of sacramental grace is that the spiritual is believed to be able and willing to use

the material. That God, Who is pure Spirit, does not disdain to use material things can be established by a series of testimonies.

1. The creation of the universe, the perpetual immanence of God, 'the strength and stay upholding all creation,' within and behind the universe, and the witness which the order and beauty of nature bears to the character of God.

2. The fact that, when God willed to make the fullest and most perfect revelation of Himself that was possible for mortal eye to see and mortal mind to understand, He made that revelation in terms of flesh and blood and reason and emotion in the Person of our Lord.

3. Since Pentecost the people of the Church have been the Body of Christ, created beings, physical beings, yet possessed and indwelt by the Holy Spirit. The indwelling, inspiring, and sanctifying power of the Spirit is seen in the actions of their lives. Human actions can be ruled by the Spirit. And human actions can testify to the Spirit. Thus the guiding of the Spirit can lead to such acts as the taking of a journey, the bearing of a burden, the assembling for a meal. And, conversely, the journey taken, the burden borne, the meal shared, can be a witness to the Spirit.

We have not yet in this particular method of approach reached the Sacrament. But in this series the supreme use of matter by Spirit is the Incarnation itself. The Incarnation has been called the Sacrament of sacraments.

Sometimes a simple parallel is drawn between the Incarnation and the Eucharist. This will not do. In the Incarnation there is what is known as a hypostatic, that is a personal, union between the divine and the human. That is never asserted of the Eucharist. The Eucharist lies somewhere between (*a*) the hypostatic union of God and Man in the Incarnation and (*b*) the general indwelling of God in all creation.

Our Lord in the Upper Room, at the end of His earthly life, when the loving, saving force that was in Him was just about to be released and universalized (by death and resurrection and ascension) for the redemption of a world, joins together those two modes of the divine existence into one. He cannot convey to inanimate objects that conscious life which is in His own Incarnate Self, His human spirit, mind, and body. But He provides that there shall be for His children in years and centuries to come a spiritual window by which His life, with its power of bringing God to them and them to God, shall reach their lives. It will reach them as truly as it has reached the disciples of His Ministry. It will do for the unnumbered millions who shall live under Pentecost all that it did for the Twelve, and the Seventy, and the few hundreds of the outer ring in Galilee.

On the other hand He must give them all this on the plain ground where they will be standing, amidst and through the material world which

will be their environment. It is all God's creation ; it is all honest ; it is all holy ; God is in all of it, the brown earth, the waving corn, the purple grapes, and a thousand things besides. Yet, even so, He will not lift all created things at once to be the simultaneous vehicles of His incarnate life. He will choose some of them. He chooses that which will take most easily a spiritual meaning—the bread that strengtheneth, the wine that maketh glad, the heart of man. He chooses those two things, and He gives them a Consecration which is a warrant of all Consecrations hereafter to be asked and given. ' By Myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, that in blessing I will bless them, and in multiplying I will multiply ' these gifts ' as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore, and ' in these gifts ' shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.'

Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that Spirit should use matter ? It may be that Festus, the detached and patronizing outsider, will say, ' Paul, thou art beside thyself. Much church-going doth make thee mad.' But Paul replies, ' I am not mad, most noble Festus.' And then he turns with an appeal to Anglicanus, the man with the background and the memories, the man not without some personal experience of religion. ' He knoweth of these things, before who also I speak freely. For I am persuaded that none of these things are hidden from him. For

these things were not done in a corner. These things are not the peculiar fancies of a few exotic souls. It has been found through many centuries by innumerable people of all sorts, wise and simple, old and young, white-handed and rough-handed, that Christ Himself consecrates the bread. Sir Anglicanus, believest thou the evidence of Christendom, thine own experience? I know that thou believest. Festus is as yet outside the family. He would be welcome there. A place is kept for him as soon as he is willing. But he has not yet had the discipline of kneeling in a line with other men, stretching obedient hands, and receiving bread, the best and purest wheat bread that may conveniently be gotten, to which, without money and without price, a purely spiritual blessing has been given for a purely spiritual purpose.'

The word 'spiritual' can never be separated from the thought of purpose. The reason why the Sacrifice of Christ, throughout His life and above all on the Cross, is a spiritual sacrifice is that, unlike the sufferings of unwilling and unconscious victims, it is filled with purpose: 'Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God.' And the purpose of the Eucharistic gift is Communion, 'the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine.' Not for nothing does the Revised Prayer Book say: 'With Thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify both us and these Thy

gifts of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, to the end that we, receiving the same, may be strengthened and refreshed both in body and soul.' The gift is given for communicants. They share the blessing and assist in the giving of it. The purpose is not that Christians may boast that 'A wonderful thing is come to pass. Christ dwells in bread.' It is that, receiving consecrated bread, they may receive Christ. As, sitting round the family table, they enjoy, not food only, but a sacrament of family life, so, kneeling round the altar, they are made partakers of bread and wine, and of much more than that.

But always of bread and wine. That remains. Belief in the Real Presence of the bread and wine is what saves us from a Eucharistic error which would correspond to Docetic or Eutychian Christology. We can have no doctrine which 'overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament,' which destroys either part of it. The bread remains bread. The spiritual is willing to use the material, the material remaining exactly and precisely as material as it was before. It is not that the material now begins to have an inner heart or core of that which is spiritual, but the spiritual now possesses the material, for a purpose.

The spiritual is dominant. The material is that which is being used. It is used for a purpose. Our warrant is a combination of the

Word of Christ, and our own continuance within His purpose. The spiritual could discard the material at will. If we depart from the purpose, we lose the guarantee we had that the spiritual is still using the material. What if we strain the purpose ; if, for example, we practise what are called ' Devotions ' before the Blessed Sacrament ? We may be right. But we diminish the security, we have not then the same guarantee as we have when the Sacrament is being used for the purpose of Communion. There are many who have such strong belief in the Real Presence that, when they visit a church and find that the Sacrament is there reserved, they feel themselves attracted to the spot ; the chapel, where the Gifts lie in an aumbry, or hang in the old English way between earth and heaven in a pyx, has an air of peace and holiness. Prayers, said in that atmosphere, are less dull, less selfish, more generous, more charitable, than at other times. The soul of the praying visitor seems to have gained by the provision which has here been made for sick parishioners. But all the same at times he may wonder if this straining of the Lord's assured purpose is simple willingness to use as much as ever He will give us, or an unspiritual departure from His will. At organized ' Devotions ' he may have this element of scruple, or wonder, even more. But at Communion he knows.

VI

ANGLICAN TEACHING

SO, it is suggested, may the terms 'presence,' 'real,' 'spiritual' be interpreted. What is there, in the history and documents of the Church of England, to encourage such interpretation?

Belief in the Real Presence has been expressed within the Church of England in more than one way. Let us first note an expression of it which became notorious in 1870. It seemed at that time very startling, and it was, at least in its original form, incautious and difficult to defend. But it was finally ruled, in a court which certainly had no prejudice in favour of such teaching, to be not inadmissible.

In 1870 the case of Sheppard *v.* Bennett was tried before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Rev. J. W. E. Bennett had used in a published pamphlet these words: 'Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore, the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them—believing that under their veil is the sacred Body of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' He was prosecuted for heresy, and the case came before the Dean of Arches and eventually before the Privy Council. In

later editions of his pamphlet, Mr. Bennett, having been apprised (in the benevolent but rather patronizing language of the Dean of Arches) of 'the error into which his slight acquaintance with the subject had led him,' substituted the following words: 'Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore Christ present in the Sacrament, under the form of bread and wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

The decision of the Privy Council was that Mr. Bennett was not to be condemned. The court did not like his teaching, but it gave him, if we may so put it, the benefit of the doubt. Few nowadays would think it desirable that such cases should come before the eminent lawyers who comprise the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But on the other hand it must be remembered that they were deciding, not the theological soundness, or otherwise, of Mr. Bennett's teaching, but its admissibility within the Church of England.

To come to more important and more familiar evidence, what does the Prayer Book say about the Real Presence? We have already noted the abundant testimony of the Prayer Book to what may be called, in general, the reality of the sacramental gift. But there are passages which suggest belief in the Real Presence in the specific sense in which we are now considering the term. One is what is called the

Black Rubric, the rubric about kneeling, at the end of the Communion Service.

Its history is as follows. In 1552, just before the promulgation of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, which marks the limit reached by the Church of England in the Protestant direction, great efforts were made by some members of the Privy Council to induce Cranmer to include a rubric against kneeling to receive Communion. Cranmer refused, and at the last moment, while the Book was being printed, the Council, without any sanction from the Church or even from Parliament, inserted a rubric which said that 'whereas it is ordained in the book of common prayer, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants kneeling should receive the holy Communion . . . we do declare that it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto *any real and essential presence* there being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood.'

The life of this Prayer Book was only eight months, and its use never extended far beyond London. But during that period the Church of England for the first and last time found itself, by the act of the Council, committed to a denial of the doctrine of the Real Presence. After the five years of Queen Mary's reign the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth omitted the

Rubric altogether. At the final revision of 1662 it came back again, but with a significant alteration. Instead of denying any 'real and essential presence,' it now denies 'any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood.'

The prohibition of the word 'corporal' is unimpeachable, even though as a matter of fact there is no one who asserts it. The reference to 'Christ's natural Flesh and Blood' is meaningless, because Christ's natural Flesh and Blood have had no existence since the Day of His Resurrection. The best thing in the Rubric is the statement that 'the Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances.' This, for those who still care to use the mediaeval language, is no doubt true, and is for them a clear and effective protest against Transubstantiation. But the general argument of the Rubric does not carry much weight to modern minds, because the only Body of the Lord which could sacramentally be present and be received by faithful communicants, is that of which the Rubric does not speak, His supernatural, spiritual Body. Moreover, the concluding argument that 'Christ's natural Body cannot at one time be in more places than one' is beside the point. The Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament is a spiritual Presence, and such a Presence can never be declared to be specifically in any *place* at all.

The main effect of the change made by the bishops in 1662 was to commit the Church to

a perfectly sound denial of any corporal presence, while the exclusion of the former temporary denial of 'any real and essential presence' seems to indicate that they deliberately intended to sanction such belief. The argument that the Revisers of 1662 had this intention has been called casuistry. In the strict sense of the word, this is exactly what it is, the application of general principles to a particular 'case.' But 'casuistry' is commonly used to denote something dishonest. Is there anything dishonest in so interpreting the *animus imponentis* of Bishop Cosin and his associates, especially Dr. Gunning, when they revised the Rubric? Their theological convictions were certainly quite different from those of the men of 1552, and when they restored in a changed form a 1552 Rubric, which had been disused in 1559 and not re-adopted in 1603, they must have meant something by their alteration.

Finally, it must be remembered that the whole setting of the Rubric is out of date. The original occasion and the still declared relevance of the Rubric is something about which there is no question at all, the propriety of kneeling to receive Communion. The Rubric apologizes in language which is for the most part quite out of date for a practice which no one dreams of questioning. The motives of the bishops in proposing to reprint it in January, 1928, were obvious and praiseworthy. It is in any case part of the 1662 Book, which remains the

standard Book. And they were rightly eager to assure the Evangelicals, to whom the Rubric had always seemed valuable, that there was no intention of denying or even belittling their characteristic sacramental teaching. But the decision solemnly to reprint in 1928 so elaborate a statement of antiquated philosophy was unfortunate.

It was unfortunate because it is always undesirable to put occasions of stumbling before persons of clear mind and scrupulous intellectual conscience. The speech of Sir Martin Conway in the House of Commons at the Prayer Book debate was much more important than was perceived by all at the time. He said that neither the 1662 Book nor the Deposited Book was really acceptable to the modern scientific mind. Now, it is no doubt inevitable that a Christian Book should fail to please some modern minds. And the makers of a Prayer Book must cater not only, and indeed not chiefly, for learned professors, but for plain people. But many Christians, by no means incorrigibly intellectualist, feel that some opportunities of re-wording Christian doctrine in modern language were lost at the revision. The reprinting of the Black Rubric at a late stage of the revision is an extreme case of this. It is a fruit of that well-intended but dangerous spirit of compromise, which has in fact smoothed the passage of the Book through the Assembly and has caused it to be accepted by different

groups, but has impaired the spiritual atmosphere of the process of its adoption.

We turn now to still more familiar ground, the Church Catechism. The Catechism about Baptism makes two points. It says, (1) 'What is the outward visible sign or form in Baptism?' That is to say, What is the thing which is used by God at Baptism as a means of grace? And the answer is, 'Water; wherein the person is baptized *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*' And then it says, (2) 'What is the inward and spiritual grace?' That is to say, What happens at Baptism? The answer is, 'A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness: for . . . we are hereby made the children of grace.'

About the Lord's Supper the Catechism asks the same two questions, (1) 'What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?' The answer is, 'Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.' It presently asks, (2) 'What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?' That is to say, What happens, what is the result? The answer is, 'The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine.' But on the subject of the Lord's Supper the Catechism interpolates in the middle a third question, not asked about Baptism, (1*a*) 'What is the inward part, or thing signified?' And the answer here is, 'The Body and Blood

of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.'

This is doctrine of the Church of England, expressed exactly where you would expect to find it, in the official instruction which is to be given to the younger generation. In the Articles of Religion, to which the clergy are required to give assent (since 1865 a general assent), you would expect more careful detailed statements, defining in somewhat technical terms the sacramental teaching of the Church of England, in contradistinction to the Scholastic doctrine of Transubstantiation on the one hand, and the merely commemorative view on the other. And that is exactly what you have. In the Communion Service you would expect, not any theological definition at all, but devotions suitable for worshippers and rules for the devout conduct of public worship. And that is exactly what you have. (The only exception is the Black Rubric, which, as we have seen, was put in for a special reason, and now survives, with its teeth drawn, and in a form that, in so far as it has any meaning at all, is unobjectionable.) But in the Catechism you would expect to find a plain, positive statement of simple theological teaching, within the comprehension of the young, but containing nothing that they will need to unlearn in later years. And that is exactly what you have.

What does this simple affirmation of the reality of the gift amount to? It is to be noted

that there is no statement about the *manner* in which that which is truly and indeed taken and received by the faithful is conceived as existing. That nowhere appears in Anglican formularies. The nearest approach to it is supplied, for those who may desire it, in the valuable reminder of Article twenty-eight that 'the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Lord's Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.' But even this is only a description, not a definition. There is no official philosophical theory about the sense in which Christ's 'heavenly and spiritual' presence is to be interpreted.

But we are reasoning beings, and though none of us are able to put our belief into satisfying words, we desire, as far as possible, to understand both the teaching of our Church and the meaning of our own experience. And what the Catechism, taken in conjunction with the Liturgy and the Articles, seems to mean is this. Consecration has a spiritual effect upon the elements. The whole Prayer of Consecration is a prayer to God, and the revised prayer in the Deposited Book calls special attention to the fact that whatever happens when it is said is the act of God. From the language of the Revised Prayer Book nobody could possibly draw the conclusion that Consecration is effected by any word, action, or volition of the priest. It is, and must be, by the act of God.

But, quite apart from the help which the Revised Book, by its inclusion of an Epiklesis,

gives us towards attaining a more spiritual and more godly view of the matter, the traditional Anglican belief is that when the Prayer of Consecration has been said, the situation is not the same as it was before. The elements are not the same. They have now a different character, a different purpose, a different capacity. Whereas, before, they were bread and wine, they are now consecrated bread and wine. In the language of the Articles they are *signa efficacia*, that is, effective signs, not merely signs of something which is absent, but signs which really do effect, or carry into execution, that of which they are the sign. They are a symbol in the ancient sense of the word symbol, i.e. 'not to be thought of as the opposite of the objective or the real : but it is the mysterious and divinely-enwrought, which stands out against the natural or profanely clear' (Harnack). They not only focus the attention of the worshippers on what God is doing for them, but they are a means by which the divine attention and the divine grace are brought to bear on the worshippers. They are, if the expression may be allowed, a factor in the divine psychology.

No doubt overmuch attention has been given, both in the way of affirmation and in the way of denial, to the doctrine of the Real Presence. It has been unduly isolated. Christians have not always remembered that the main purpose of the Sacrament is not to give us the Real Presence, but to open for us an approach to

God, the Holy and Undivided Trinity, through Jesus Christ our Lord. The three main ideas which together constitute this general purpose are : (1) Obedience to Christ's command, (2) the pleading or presenting (as completely as possible, and therefore necessarily before both God and man) of the once-wrought but eternal Sacrifice of Calvary, and (3) the raising of the communicants, through faithful participation, to the heavenly level where Christ is, at the right hand of God.

So is the purpose to be analysed. And the Real Presence is our assurance that the purpose of the Sacrament is really being effected. That is why the Lord's Supper is called a *means* of grace. It might be as truly called a *means* of prayer and worship. We do not go to Communion in order to be for a while under the influence of the Real Presence of our Lord. The Real Presence is a fact, and that is why it is worth while to go to Communion. The Real Presence assures us that the road is open, in both directions. But we go to Communion in order to effect spiritual contact with God.

Our Lord says, 'I am the Way,' that is, the Way to God. He has also given us the Sacrament, which is His way of shewing Himself to be the Way for us. It is therefore essential that we should follow His sacramental way, and also that we should, as far as possible, understand the truth about it. But the ultimate reality is God. It is the purpose of Christ, and

it is also the nature of Christ, to reveal God. 'He that receiveth Me, receiveth Him that sent Me.' The method by which we touch the divine reality is *per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum*. And Jesus Christ's method for giving us 'access with confidence' is the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, that is, His Life. Of this Sacrament the elements are the outward, and an essential, part.

A practical illustration will perhaps make this more clear. The importance of such things has been greatly exaggerated. But it indicates a point of view, and contains some easily intelligible teaching. Many priests, saying the Prayer of Consecration, are accustomed to bend the knee, once or more times, for a moment to the ground. Some do this many times at fixed points. These points are determined for them by the rubrics of the modern Roman Rite, with which they are familiar. They take the view that it is desirable to supplement the not very full rubrical directions of the Prayer Book, and that it is legitimate to supplement them from the rite of another Church.[1] Other priests have been in the habit of making this genuflexion twice, at the end of each half of what are often called our Lord's 'Words of Institution.'[2]

[1] Of this practice it will only be said here that it is hard to believe that it was the intention of the makers of the Prayer Book or that it is now the intention of the Church of England that such interpolations should be made from that quarter.

[2] They should more properly be called His Words of Administration. His Words of Institution, contained in the verb 'He gave thanks,' are not known to us.

This always seemed to some of those who used it less than satisfactory, because they did not really believe that the repetition of even such sacred words as those of the Master in the Upper Room by themselves effected the Consecration, still less that the Consecration was divided into two parts, each effected by one half of the words. But the words were obviously of great solemnity. The Prayer Book seems to attach very special importance to them, and when, as occasionally happens, a second Consecration is required, the Prayer Book directs that the words, almost the bare words by themselves, shall be repeated in a way that gives no indication that they are really part of a prayer. At any rate these clergymen were eager to mark in some way their belief that the situation at the end of the Prayer of Consecration was not the same as before. Genuflexion seemed a suitable way of doing this. But it need hardly be said that the precise nature of the act is not of great importance. There were always some who preferred the deep inclination of the body which is known as 'profound reverence' or a 'Sarum bow.'

All this is put in the past tense, because the Revised Prayer Book has already exercised a powerful teaching influence. It calls attention to the fact, never doubted, but not so plain in the 1662 Liturgy as in some, that God, through the Holy Spirit, Who proceeds from the Father and the Son, is the real Consecrator. But, inasmuch as God in spiritual things requires

human co-operation, the human co-efficient of the divine Act is the whole Prayer of Consecration. This is said by the minister and sealed by the general 'Amen' of the whole congregation, and is now shown more clearly than ever to be a prayer by its Epiklesis. The suggestion of the new Prayer is surely that the special act of reverence, a genuflexion or a low bow, should take place once, at the end of the Prayer, after the 'Amen.' Accordingly, some priests at least, on the publication of the text of the Revised Book, were inspired to amend and simplify their practice.

To complete this subject, and perhaps to make clearer what may be difficult to some, one more word may be added. There seems good reason that the communicants, on leaving and returning to their seats, should perform a similar action. The Canons of 1640 (which were promulged by Convocation and sanctioned by the King and Privy Council, but never came before Parliament)—

'think it very meet and behoveful, and heartily commend it to all good and well-affected people, members of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord the said acknowledgement, by doing reverence and obeisance' (which means, in the language of the period, a bow) 'both at their coming in and going out of the said churches, chancels, or chapels, according to the most ancient custom of the Primitive Church in the purest times, and of the Church also for many years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.'

If this is sound, it seems reasonable that those who desire to make at the appropriate time a further acknowledgement of the fact that the Prayer of Consecration has been said and that the Consecrated Bread and Wine is now upon the altar, should do it in the way before suggested.

It is of vital importance that magical ideas, or ideas of a physical or spatial presence, should not be encouraged. Such notions are unworthy of God's truth. But it is at least not less vital that we should, as far as may be, do justice to God's truth. In view of the fact that our contact with God is effected by the bodily act (accompanied of course by the proper spiritual dispositions of repentance, faith, and charity) of eating and drinking, it is not wonderful that some are happy to express their belief by a bodily act of another kind. In all such matters it is well to bear in mind the wise advice of the First Prayer Book :

> As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures ; they may be used or left as every man's devotion serveth without blame.

These things are optional, and no single one of them is of any particular importance. Yet the instinct for ceremonial and the actual use of it in other connections is so general, that if the circumstances of Church history had been different, and prejudice in such matters had not been aroused, religious ceremonial would seem much more natural to all than it now

seems to some. There would always be the intellectually Puritan class, minds which would make the minimum use of symbolism, striding lightly from peak to peak in the difficult realm of abstract thought. But such extreme ascetics would be exceptional. It would be a matter of taste and temperament. And if the controversial spirit could be eliminated, varieties of preference would pass without blame, and perhaps almost without comment.

Why is it that so much objection is taken in some quarters to the ceremonial that is practised in other quarters? By 'objection' is meant not merely distaste or lack of appreciation. That much might fairly be expected, and allowed, in both directions. Supposed exaggerations and supposed defects would be regretted by persons of divergent types. But what is meant here by objection is the desire to abolish the variety complained of. This appears to be strongly felt in one direction only, the direction of abolishing supposed excess. Why is it felt?

It would probably be replied that the ceremonial resented is believed to symbolize Transubstantiation. Now, it is surely impossible that any ceremonial can definitely and exclusively symbolize a doctrine of the *manner* of Christ's presence so philosophical and elaborate as Transubstantiation. That is not what symbolism does. Symbolism suggests an attitude. It does not define a philosophy. And in any case it is the fact that a number of Christian

men who practise the kind of ceremonial which has just been described do make the following assertion : 'The symbolism which I prefer, practise, and teach is not intended to suggest Transubstantiation, which in fact I do not hold, never have held, and am most unlikely ever to hold in the future. It is intended to suggest a view of the Real Presence which I believe to be in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer, and is and has been shared by countless Churchmen whose loyalty to the Church of England cannot be seriously questioned.' This being so, can it not be accepted as a variety of emphasis by which the fullness of Church of England life is enriched ?

One more question—Why is there this emphasis ? Why is such symbolism practised by Christian people ? It is an essential question, because we shall always get nearer to understanding and nearer to truth by asking what things are liked than by asking why things are disliked. Why is it said that Consecration 'makes a difference' ? Is it because the priest has repeated certain words and performed certain actions ? In view of the tradition of Christendom and the Book of Common Prayer, it is essential that the minister shall be a priest, and that he shall say certain words and perform certain actions. Nevertheless the answer suggested is not by itself the answer to the question asked. And in so far as it may truly be said to depend at all on what the priest says and does,

it is because what he (representatively) says and does is part of a prayer to God.

Consecration is the act of God. This is not merely conceded but maintained by all. It is true that in the Western Church there has been a tendency to attach special importance to the words, 'This is My Body, This is My Blood.' This tendency went very far in the Mediaeval Church, and it does not seem to have lost any of its momentum in the Roman Church of to-day.

It has been supposed by some in the Church of England (which inevitably shares to a considerable extent the Western outlook) that the saying of those words represents the moment of consecration. On the other hand the habit of the East has always been to emphasize considerations of a more strictly theological character, and to attach special importance to the invocation of the Holy Spirit to bless the elements. The Prayer Book of 1549 contained an Invocation ('Epiklesis' is the technical term), which was put in by Cranmer from the Eastern Liturgies, of which he knew something. But it was inserted before the Dominical Words and it had the appearance of leading up to them as to a kind of climax. After 1549 the Epiklesis disappeared, and the repetition of the Dominical Words was evidently intended to be the climax of the Prayer.

It was never in the least necessary to use the words in any magical sense. They were in any case part of a prayer. But if any user of the

Prayer was disposed to take it in a magical sense, it was not wholly impossible for him to find a handle for his superstition. For the old Prayer ended abruptly with the Upper Room. It had no word of the Resurrection, the Ascension, or of the return of Christ at Pentecost and the perpetual endowment of the Church with spiritual life. It made it indeed not altogether easy to give the fullest meaning to the command, 'In remembrance of Me.' The Person Whose 'remembrance' is here commanded is Christ, the whole Christ, not only as He was in the Upper Room, not only as He was on Calvary, but as all that He has come to be and is. But the Prayer ended with the Upper Room.

In the new Prayer the scene in the Upper Room is solemnly rehearsed before God and the congregation; then mention is made, not only of 'the precious Death and Passion of Thy dear Son,' but of 'His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension'; and then, following the order of the divine events as they succeeded one another in the historic chapters of Revelation, the consecrating power of the Holy Spirit is sought. It is because that supreme *Veni Creator* is a prayer of faith and a claiming of divine assurances, that communicants always receive 'meekly kneeling,' and sometimes add other signs of welcome to a Gift.

Printed by A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., London and Oxford